José Pereira

Suárez

Between Scholasticism & Modernity

Marquette University Press

SUÁREZ

BETWEEN SCHOLASTICISM AND MODERNITY

JOSÉ PEREIRA

SUÁREZ

BETWEEN SCHOLASTICISM AND MODERNITY

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Marquette Studies in Philosophy
No. 52
Andrew Tallon, Series Editor

© 2006 Marquette University Press
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201-3141
All rights reserved.
www.marquette.edu/mupress/

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pereira, José, 1931-
Suárez : between scholasticism and modernity / José Pereira.
p. cm. — (Marquette studies in philosophy ; no. 52)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-87462-750-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Suárez, Francisco, 1548-1617. I. Title.
B785.S824P47 2007
196'.1—dc22

2006100382

Cover sketch of Suárez by the author.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992.

Association of American University Presses

Marquette University Press
Milwaukee

The Association of Jesuit University Presses

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prologue 9

1. Baroque Scholasticism & its Consummator Suárez ..37

2. The Philosophy of Suárez 67

3. The Existential Integralism of Suárez 97

4. The Suarezianization of Thomism:
John of St. Thomas 141

5. The Impact of Suárez on Modern Philosophy 173

6. The Impact of Suárez on the Rationalists & their
Successors 225

7. The Impact of Suárez on the Empiricists 295

Epilogue 311

Bibliography 313

Index 359

IOSEPHO HELLIN

(1883-1973)

FIDELI DISCIPULO

ET OMNIBUS AUDITORIBUS

EXIMII DOCTORIS

EUROPAE

ATQUE ADEO ORBIS UNIVERSI

MAGISTRI

A FIDELI SECTATORI EIUS

IOSEPHO PEREIRA

DICATUM

Note on the texts and translations of the works of Suárez

Quotations from the works of Suárez are from the 26 volumes of his *Opera Omnia*, Ludovicus Vivès, Paris, 1856-1861. When he is quoted in the footnotes, only his work is mentioned, without his name. All other authors have their names preceding their works. The works of Suárez generally have a tripartite division, as liber-caput-numerus (LCN) & disputatio-sectio-numerus (DSN). We have quoted from the following 12 books of the *Opera*, with the volume indicated in brackets: *De Deo Uno* [1] LCN, *De angelis* [2] LCN, *De opere sex dierum* [3] LCN, *De anima* [3] LCN, *De ultimo fine hominis* [4} LCN, *De legibus* [5-6] LCN, *De scientia Dei futurorum contingentium* [11] LCN, *De fide* [12} DSN, *De charitate* [12] DSN, *Defensio fidei Catholicae* [24] LCN, *Disputationes Metaphysicae* [25-26] DSN. In addition, we quote *De Gratia* [7], Prolegomenon-caput-numerus, and *De Incarnatione* [17] quaestio-articulus-commentarius. All the titles of Suárez's books are quoted *in extenso*, except the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, which is abbreviated as *DM*. Reference is first to the divisions of the work (disputation: section: number) and then, in brackets, to the Vivès edition [volume: page].

All the translations are my own. Very little of Suárez's work has been translated into English, and that almost exclusively of the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*. Of the 54 disputations of this great work, English translations are available of the following: 5 (Jorge Gracia), 6 (J. F. Ross), 7 (Cyril Vollert), 10 & 11 (Jorge Gracia & Douglas Davis), 15 (John Kronen & Jeremiah Reedy), 17-19 (Alfred Freddoso), 20–22 (Alfred Freddoso), 31 (Norman Wells) and 54 (John Doyle). The last two translated disputations are particularly relevant, as Wells's translation treats of what Suárez considers to be real being, and Doyle's, of fictitious being as contrasted with the real. Wells's translation is entitled *Francis Suárez on the Essence of Finite Being as Such*. On *the Existence of that Essence and their Distinction*. The title of Doyle's translation is *On Beings of Reason (De Entibus Rationis)*. Both books are published by the Marquette University Press at Milwaukee, the former in 1983 and the latter in 1995. The topic of our work, however, is treated in disputations 2, 28, and 50, besides 31.

PROLOGUE

I. IMPORTANCE OF SUÁREZ IN THE HISTORY OF THOUGHT
1. Unparalleled vastness of achievement
2. Systematization of metaphysics
3. The creation of Baroque systems
4. Baroque remodeling of the major medieval systems

II. SUÁREZ, PHILOSOPHER & THEOLOGIAN
1. Suarezianism, the major Baroque system
2. The Suarezian synthesis
3. The harvest of other Baroque syntheses

III. SUÁREZ, MORAL PHILOSOPHER
1. Foundation of moral theology
2. Suárez, champion of democracy
3. Suárez, philosopher of international law
4. Suárez, theologian of religious toleration
5. Suárez, promoter of intra-Christian dialogue
6. Suárez, fulfiller of the Catholic Enlightenment
7. Suárez, inspirer of freedom movements

IV. SUÁREZ, FOUNDER OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY
1. Suarezian vocabulary as groundwork for modern philosophy
2. The formal and objective concepts
3. Suarezian themes of the formal concept
4. Suarezian themes of the objective concept

I. IMPORTANCE OF SUÁREZ IN THE HISTORY OF THOUGHT

Suárez enjoys such a knowledge of medieval philosophy, as to put to shame any modern historian of medieval thought. On each and every question he seems to know everybody and everything, and to

> read his book is like attending the Last Judgment of four centuries of Christian speculation by a dispassionate judge.[1]

Francisco Suárez, *Europae atque adeo orbis universi magister*,[2] stands between the maturation of Scholasticism and the rise of modern philosophy. We hope in these pages to show that he is the consummator of the former and the founder of the latter.

How shall we describe the significance of the *Doctor Eximius* (Extraordinary or Uncommon Doctor)—the prime theologian and philosopher of the Baroque age—in the history of philosophical and theological speculation?

1. Unparalleled vastness of achievement

To begin with, this Iberian genius is the author of the most titanic enterprise undertaken by any single individual in the history of speculative thought. His *Opera Omnia* (published by Vivès, containing most, but not all, his writings) is not a collection of random and heterogeneous essays, written in response to particular (and often unconnected) problems, but is made up of units of discourse organized in a complete system, each unit assigned its proper place in the total architectonic structure. The *Opera Omnia* has 14 books, printed in 26 volumes, containing 4,212 sections, and 22,365 pages, totaling in all, it is said, to 21 million words![3] These volumes include the Doctor's most celebrated work, the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* (1597), which exemplifies the author's phenomenal erudition: it refers to 245 authors, and has 7709 citations, including 1,735 of Aristotle, and 1,008 of Aquinas. It is estimated to contain 1.4 million words.[4]

Eminent success, in his age, attended Suárez, the consummator of Scholasticism, as can be judged from the fact that, between 1597 and 1636, the two bulky volumes of over 2,000 pages, of the *Dispu-*

1 Étienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1949, p.99.

2 Part of an inscription in the University of Coimbra, recorded in Joseph H. Fichter, S. J., *Man of Spain*, New York: Macmillan, 1940, p. 340.

3 Computation of Joseph Fichter, *Man of Spain: Francis Suárez*. New York: Macmillan, 1940, p. 327.

4 Computation of John P. Doyle (transl. & ed.), *The Metaphysical Demonstration of the Existence of God. Metaphysical Disputes 28-29. Francisco Suárez, S. J.* South Bend, Indiana, St. Augustine's Press 2004, p. xi.

tationes Metaphysicae, went through 17 editions. In contrast the slim and popular *Meditationes*, of the father of modern philosophy, René Descartes (1596-1650), published between 1641 and 1700, went through only 9 editions. For at least 50 years Suárez's work was adapted for metaphysical instruction not just in the Catholic universities of Europe, but also in those of the Lutheran and Calvinist (German and Dutch) persuasion. By the 18th century it was still (in its then anamorphic form, transformed by the impact of Leibniz) at the root of the understanding that philosophers had of metaphysics, particularly in the form given it by Christian Wolff (1679-1754).

Disputationes Morales. Had the Uncommon Doctor been able to compose a work with such or similar title, it would doubtless have had the same resonance as his metaphysical masterpiece. It would have crowned the movement promoting freedom, inaugurated around 1500 by Queen Isabel la Católica (1451-1504), when she outlawed the slavery of the Amerindians. The movement was energized by the theologians of Salamanca, who speculated on the theme of freedom and on its basis, reason, a movement that can only be described as the Catholic Enlightenment, one that anticipated, by two centuries, its secular counterpart, whose main goals were also reason and freedom. The re-examination of these problems was motivated by the conquest of the lands impinged on by the Iberian powers in their world-wide expansion from the late 15th century. In response to this phenomenon, two intellectual movements arose in counterpoint: the Catholic Enlightenment, as we have called it, and its counterpart, which deserves no better title than the Catholic "Dis-Enlightenment" (justifying the oppression of the natives conquered by Christian powers). We shall discuss both movements in more detail in Chapter 2.

What Suárez thought on these problems left a profound impress on the Catholic moral theologians of the Baroque age. And his impact on Protestant ethics was second only to that on Protestant metaphysics. Many of the leading modern philosophers from Hobbes to Schopenhauer studied ethics in textbooks written from a partly Suarezian standpoint. The 17th century witnessed the publication of dozens of manuals of moral philosophy written by both Catholic and Protestant moralists. In most of these textbooks the ethics of Suárez left its mark. Two typical examples are the Dutch Calvinist Francis Burgersdijck (1590-1635), metaphysician and ethicist, author of a much-used textbook, *Idea philosophiae moralis* (1644), containing a Protestant

version of the ethics of Suárez; and his pupil Adriaan Heereboord (1614-1661), also a metaphysician and ethicist, admirer of Suárez but follower of Descartes, and author of *Philosophia rationalis, moralis et naturalis* (1654). Among those who were introduced to ethics by Burgerdijck's manual was John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), exponent of individual liberty, the rights of the minority and the need for a public conscience, all ideas dear to the *Doctor Eximius*.

Finally, the clear affinity to the political authority of Suárez with that of Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) as expressed in the *Declaration of Independence* of 1776, leads one to wonder if the 18th century American colonists were exposed to the Uncommon Doctor's thought. The answer seems to be that they might indeed have been, through Charles Carroll (1737-1832), the only Catholic signatory to that *Declaration*, who worked closely with Jefferson, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton and George Washington, the founding fathers of the American republic. An American patriot and revolutionary, Carroll was trained at the celebrated Jesuit colleges of St. Omer in Belgium and Louis-le-Grand in Paris, where he could not have avoided being exposed to the democratic philosophy of Suárez, particularly since that philosophy was then being furiously attacked in Europe by the state absolutists and regalists, leading to the suppression of the Jesuit order in 1773.[5]

But the highest approval of the Uncommon Doctor came from the summit of the Catholic system, the papacy. The title *Doctor Eximius et Pius* (Extraordinary or Uncommon and Pious Doctor), was conferred on him by Paul V Borghese (r. 1605-1621). He was referred to as *Doctor Eximius* by Alexander VII Chigi (1655-1667), Benedict XIV Lambertini (1740-1758) and Pius XII Pacelli (1939-1958), the latter being his most devoted papal admirer.[6]

---

5 Scott McDermott, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton: Faithful Revolutionary*. Scepter Publishers, 2002.

6 Pius XII's admiration for Suárez was clearly expressed in his address to the Gregorianum on October 17, 1953, on the occasion of its fourth centenary: Pius asked the company not to be afraid that the so-called "positive" sciences posed any threat for "positive" theology: Exemplo sunt vobis ipse Doctor Angelicus, qui "positivarum" cognitionum appetens erat, et ex primaevi Athenaei vestri theologis Franciscus Suárez, qui iure post Sanctum Thomam primoribus sacrae theologiae accensendus est...*AAS* 45-14 (November 15, 1953), p. 684. More important is his reference to the *Doctor Eximius* in two

2. Systematization of metaphysics

The *Disputationes Metaphysicae* is perhaps the most extensive metaphysical treatise ever written, unequaled for the symmetry and clarity of its architectonic design. It is also the first modern tract on the entire field of metaphysics[7] that reflects the speculation of its author and not that of another thinker, in our case Aristotle (384-322 B. C.). For the medievals the study of philosophy meant the study of the "Philosopher," and was recorded in commentaries on his somewhat incoherently configured opus, *Metaphysics*. The time had arrived, Suárez felt, to systematize metaphysics and to abandon the medieval habit of writing commentaries. The Uncommon Doctor describes how he came to adopt his then uncommon method in the following words:

> I had always judged that, in understanding and penetrating into the meaning of things, there was great value in inquiring into and judging them by a suitable method, which I was hardly able to respect or not at all if I were required to treat all the questions [pertinent to metaphysics] incidentally and as though by chance, according as they occur in the text of the Philosopher. For that reason I believed it would be easier and more useful if, following the order of doctrine, I were to inquire into all the questions that could be investigated and desired about the whole object of this wisdom [metaphysics], and to place them before the reader's eyes.[8]

---

solemn ecclesiastical documents, the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* of November 1, 1950, defining the dogma of the Assumption, and the encyclical *Ad caeli reginam*, of October 11, 1954, developing the theology of the regality of Mary. In both documents Pius refers to Suárez's *De mysteriis vitae Christi*; in the former to disp. 3, sect. 5, n. 31 [19: 44], and in the latter to disp. 22, sect. 2, n. 4 [19: 327].

7 F. Jordán Gallego Salvadores, "El Maestro Diego Mas y su Tratado de Metafísica," *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 43 (1970), pp. 3-92. The author of this article claims that the work of the Dominican Diego Mas (1553-1608), *Metaphysica Disputatio, seu de Ente et de eius Proprietatibus* (1587), in five books, which antedates Suárez's great work by 10 years, is the first systematic treatise of metaphysics. This is hardly the case, as Mas only covers the following subjects: being (book 1), essence and existence, the transcendentals, unity, truth & goodness, in general (book 2), unity (book 3), truth (book 4) and goodness (book 5).

8 *DM*, *Ratio et discursus totius operis. Ad lectorem*., the very first (unnumbered) page of the work: Et quoniam iudicavi semper, magnam ad res intelligendas ac penetrandas, in eis convenienti methodo inquirendis et iudicandis,

When an author is formulating his own thought, its literary expression can emerge from his mind in an organic fashion, while if the author is seeking to faithfully expound the thought of another, his expression tends to be crabbed, inelastic and inorganic. There is always the fear that he could distort the latter's ideas while being unfaithful to his own. With the *Disputationes* that fear is dispelled. Renaissance authors—like Agostino nifo (c. 1473-1538/1545), Crisostomo Javelli (1488-1550) and Diego Mas (1553-1608)—had been publishing systematic essays on metaphysical topics without commentary; but their essays did not cover the entire field of metaphysics. When they did cover this field they did not venture beyond the text of Aristotle, which they interpreted only through commentary. Completing what these Renaissance philosophers had begun, Suárez produced a work that embraced all of metaphysics, but was free of commentary. With the *Disputationes* the period of medieval philosophy ends and the modern begins.

3. The creation of Baroque systems

The system of Suárez is the product of the Baroque age, an age that was as fascinated by the architectonics of thought as of architecture. But besides creating Suarezianism, this age also gave greater coherence of form and content to the major systems of medieval times—the creations of Bonaventure, Thomas and Scotus. It also reduced to order the thought of medieval thinkers who had not produced complete systems of their own in their time: thinkers such as the *Doctor Magnificus*, the Benedictine Anselm (1033-1109); the *Doctor Mellifluus*, the Cistercian Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153); the *Doctor Solemnis*, Henry of Ghent (c. 1217-1293), official theologian of the Servite order; and the *Doctor Fundatissimus*, Aegidius Romanus (c. 1243-1316), official theologian of the Augustinian order. These minor systems appear to have been only theological and to have brought out no independent philosophical works. Prominent among the Anselmians was José Saenz de Aguirre (1630-1699, *Sancti Anselmi... Theologia*, 1679-1685); among the Bernardians, Albericus Burghoff (1614-

---

vim positam esse, quam observare vix aut ne vix quidem possem, si, expositorum more, quaestiones omnes, prout obiter et veluti casu circa textum Philosophi occurrunt, pertractarem, idcirco expeditius et utilius fore censui, servato doctrinae ordine, ea omnia inquirere, et ante oculos lectoris proponere, quae de toto huius sapientiae obiecto investigari et desiderari poterat.

1665, *Bernardus Theologus. Sive Summa Theologiae... Doctoris Bernardi... Scholasticorum Doctrina et Consensu Illustrata*, 1673); among the Aegidians Federico Gavardi (1634-1715, *Schola Aegidiana, sive Theologia Exantiquata Juxta Doctrinam Sancti Augustini*, 1678-1696) and Gianlorenzo Berti (1696-1766, *De Theologicis Disciplinis*, 1739-1745).

4. Baroque re-modeling of the major medieval systems

Though hampered by the commentarial method, the genius of medieval thinkers had created the three magnificent systems we just alluded to—Bonaventurianism, Thomism and Scotism—which would be recast in the more nuanced and elegant language of Baroque Scholasticism. The authors of these intellectual constructions (or re-constructions) displayed a passionate interest in philosophy, which they now methodized, while preserving each system's distinctive character. If the systems of the great medieval thinkers call to mind the Gothic cathedrals, like Amiens, the system of Suárez reminds us of the cathedrals of the Renaissance and the Baroque, like St. Peter's in Rome.

II. SUÁREZ PHILOSOPHER AND THEOLOGIAN

1. Suarezianism, the major Baroque system

The most comprehensive of the Baroque systems was that of Suárez. The comprehensiveness which is characteristic of his thought is thus described by a modern historian of Scholastic philosophy, in the passage quoted at the beginning of this essay:

> Suárez enjoys such a knowledge of medieval philosophy, as to put to shame any modern historian of medieval thought. On each and every question he seems to know everybody and every thing, and to read his book is like attending the Last Judgment of four centuries of Christian speculation by a dispassionate judge.[9]

Not just those four centuries, one could make bold to say, but the ages preceding those four, indeed the whole span of time from the an-

9 Étienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1949, p.99.

cient Greeks to their medieval successors as well as some works of the emerging modern age.

Of all the Baroque philosophies newly created or re-organized, Suarezianism can claim to be the definitive Scholastic system. A system of this description could only have arisen if there was in existence an intellect of phenomenal erudition, one capable of viewing, in a single optic, Scholasticism's entire accomplishment (incomplete in medieval times), especially in its Augustinian, Bonaventurian, Thomist, Scotist and Nominalist modalities; if that intellect, in addition, was endowed with the requisite dispassionateness to adjudicate between the School's many doctrines, appreciate their complex nuances, control their intricate detail, and harmonize their conflicting positions, while discerning a comprehensively simple structure behind them, the only intellect, in other words, possessed of the ability to preside over Scholasticism's Last Judgment: and if such an intellect was that of Francisco Suárez, the Uncommon Doctor, and of no other, then the Suarezian is Scholasticism's definitive system.

2. The Suarezian synthesis

Suarezianism is also the only Scholastic system where a single author integrated his own methodically structured philosophy and theology into a single architectonic composite—which can be described as a "super-system"—with the former being made the foundation for the latter. The three medieval titans, Bonaventure, Aquinas and Scotus [the Big Three], had orchestrated their theologies, and may have intended to similarly build up their philosophies, but were unable so to do because of the brevity of their lives, for Bonaventure lived to be only 54, Aquinas 49, and Scotus 42. The task of composing uniform syntheses of their philosophies and theologies was left to the successors of the three titans, like the Baroque Thomist John of St.Thomas (1589-1644) and the Baroque Scotist Claude Frassen (1620-1711). The successors were men of genius and did indeed produce works of high caliber, but they were not the creators of the three systems, and were conditioned by the philosophical backgrounds and concerns often alien to the creators—facts which have led to disputes as to whether the later formulations accurately reflect the thought of the three titans, a predicament especially acute in Thomism today.

3. The harvest of other Baroque syntheses

Suárez, at one swoop, had accomplished three operations: the systematizing of his theology; the systematizing of his philosophy; and the integrating of the two systems into a super-system. The followers of the three medieval schools sought to imitate the Uncommon Doctor's uncommon achievement, but they did it in three separate operations. *First*, formulating the theological synthesis of their school independently of the commentarial method. *Second*, methodizing their philosophy on the basis of the unsystematic shape of it found in the founders' writings, and to express it with a nuanced clarity inaccessible to the simple and often naïve Latin style of the medieval thinkers. *Third*, integrating their synthesized theology and philosophy into a single or "super"-system. The Bonaventurians, Thomists and Scotists re-formulated the doctrines of their schools by the organic method, with as little use of the commentary as possible. Some writers worked on their school's theology and others on its philosophy, as in the following examples:

Bonaventurianism
Philosophy: MARCELLUS REGIENSIS (1609-1682), *Summa seraphica,* 1669
Theology: GAUDENTIUS BONTEMPUS (1612-1672), *Palladium theologicum,* 1676

Scotism
Philosophy: CLAUDIUS FRASSEN (1620-1711), *Scotus academicus,* 1672-1674
Theology: FRANCISCUS HENNO (1662-1714), *Theologia dogmatica et scholastica,* 1706-1713

Thomism
Philosophy: ANTOINE GOUDIN (1639-1696), *Philosophia*, 1671
Theology: CHARLES-RENÉ BILLUART (1685-1757), *Summa Sancti Thomae Hodiernis Academicorum Moribus Accomodata*,1746-1751

Now that the Schools had produced treatises, compiled by different authors, containing the entire syntheses of Bonaventurianism, Thomism and Scotism, it was possible to combine these syntheses into super-systems, produced by single authors, again on the Suarezian model, the singleness of the authors assuring the combined works a unified

character. The Baroque age was prodigal in men of comprehensive intelligence, masters of their school of thought, who could discourse on that school's philosophy and theology, and thus create super-systems that were the equivalents of Suarezianism.

Bonaventurianism: MARCUS A BAUDUNIO (c. 1606-1692)
Philosophy: *Paradisus philosophicus*, 1664
Theology: *Paradisus theologicus*, 1661-1663
Thomism: JOHN OF ST. THOMAS (1589-1644), sometimes titled *Doctor Profundus*
Philosophy: *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus*, 1637-1638
Theology: *Cursus theologicus thomisticus*, 1637-1644...1667
Scotism: CRESCENTIUS KRISPER (c. 1680-1749)
Philosophy: *Philosophia scholae scotisticae*, 1735
Theology: *Theologia scholae scotisticae*, 1728-1729

III. SUÁREZ, MORAL PHILOSOPHER

1. Foundation of moral theology

Suárez had laid the metaphysical foundations of speculative theology, but his plan to do the same for moral theology[10] was not realized. He referred to this plan in an influential work that was only posthumously published, *De angelis* (1620). The following words are from the *Proemium ad lectorem*:

> For just as man, among all creatures, has a singular composition of body and spirit, he therefore demands a special consideration, notably of that part which is principal in him, and the foundation of all good and evil, happiness and misery [the soul]. And particularly for that reason we judged that this Treatise [of the Soul, *De anima*] was to be adjoined to the present work, for, as in the Metaphysics [*Disputationes Metaphysicae*, 1597] we had laid the foundations of speculative theology, in the same manner, here, we desire to prepare the way for moral theology. For the moral doctrine depends on the inner knowledge of the soul, its faculties and operations. Hence, whatever we judge to be the most useful to such an end, we shall,

10 Eleuterio Elorduy, "Suárez en la historia de la moral," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia*, 7 (1980), pp.133-147.

> in this Treatise of the Soul—which we often promised for this very reason—seek to diligently inquire into and to expedite.[11]

De angelis seems to have been influential in inspiring the production not so much of Baroque moral theology, as of modern philosophy through Suárez's "disciple" Descartes (1596-1650). Still, the Uncommon Doctor was able to uncommonly treat of topics which are crucial to us in the 21st century, such as democracy, international law, religious toleration, and intra-Christian dialogue. Though our interest in the present work is primarily metaphysical, a cursory glance at these topics would help to put the Doctor's work in perspective.

These topics were the preoccupation of a movement unwittingly launched by Queen Isabel la Católica (1451-1504), when, in 1500, she banned slavery in the New World. This movement was to continue for three centuries and beyond: it was devoted to the ideals of reason and freedom, and came to be known as the Enlightenment. The movement underwent two phases: the first, and lesser known, "Catholic" Enlightenment,[12] of the 16th and 17th centuries, and the far more renowned ("Secular") Enlightenment, of the 18th century.

Reason and freedom, Suárez maintained, are intimately connected. Reason is a faculty that is bound only by absolute evidence, and is indifferent to all other knowledge presented to it; likewise the faculty that derives from reason, the will, is bound only by absolute goodness, and is indifferent to all other good that it encounters, an indifference that can be described as "freedom."

Freedom takes two forms, religious and political. *Religious freedom*, is based on the principle that religious faith cannot be coerced, neither

---

11 *De angelis, Proemium ad lectorem*. [2: XII]: Nam sicut homo inter omnes creaturas singularem habet corporis et spiritus compositionem, ita peculiarem etiam considerationem postulat; maxime illius partis, quae in eo praecipua est, et omnis boni vel mali, felicitatis vel miseriae, fundamentum. Quem tractatum ob eam maxime rationem huic operi adiungendum duximus, quoniam in *Metaphysica* speculativae theologiae fundamentum iecimus, ita hic ad moralem theologiam viam parare cupimus. Pendet autem moralis doctrina ex interna animi et facultatum ac operum eius cognitione; ideoque quidquid ad eum finem utilius iudicabimus, diligenter in hoc tractatu *De anima*, quem ob hanc causam saepius promisimus, diligenter inquirere et expedire cupimus.

12 The phrase "Catholic Enlightenment" appears to have been first used by the renowned Chilean historian Mario Góngora del Campo (1915-1985).

by Church nor State. The functions of Church and State differ. The goal of the State is only a natural one (happiness in this life, through peace and justice), and so does not extend to supernatural matters. The goal of the Church is supernatural (happiness in the afterlife), which is entirely beyond human compulsion to realize. *Political freedom* is basic to the political process. Legitimate political authority comes from God, not by any special divine act, but simply as a consequence of God's having made man political by nature. This authority consequently inheres in the whole community, and not in any single individual.

2. Suárez, champion of democracy

Political freedom functions through two kinds of institution, natural and positive; democracy exemplifies the former kind and monarchy the latter. The *natural* or *quasi-natural* (or pre-political) institution of democracy begins to exist spontaneously, without intervention of any created will, when a group of human beings comes together for a political end. Hence such an institution—democracy—derives its authority immediately from God. On the other hand, the *positive* institution of democracy (one that develops an elaborate practical structure specific to particular times and places), requires the intervention of the created will. Likewise, monarchy and aristocracy cannot be introduced without positive institution, divine and human, because natural reason alone does not determine the necessity of any particular type of government. In consequence, monarchy and aristocracy are not immediately from God. But democracy can exist without positive institution; it can exist as a natural institution alone, because reason itself declares that the supreme political power flows from an autonomous human community, unless it is transferred to another person, persons, or a new institution.[13]

But this natural democracy can, and for its own common good normally will, transfer its authority to a king or a body of men, who accordingly rule only with the consent of the people who invested them with that authority. But once the transfer of authority is made to a monarch (or oligarchs) it cannot easily be withdrawn. Still, if the monarch acts tyrannically the community can depose him. All this is not

13 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*, lib. 3, cap. 2, nn. 6-8 [24: 208-209].

to say that Suárez is a supporter of democracy, at least in the evolved sense that we tend to use the term today.

3. Suárez, philosopher of international law

This community of men, this (natural) democracy divinely invested with authority, Suárez says, need not comprise the entire human race, with all mankind being under a single government. Such a mammoth institution would be governable with difficulty, so it is perfectly legitimate for there to be several political entities, be they democratic, monarchical or aristocratic. But no matter how many such entities divide the human race, it is still one. As the great Doctor declares in an eloquent passage, the human race, whatever its divisions, has a unity that is not only specific, but also political and moral, required by precept to exercise love and mercy to all its members. For all the communities that make up mankind are not self-sufficient, and are in need of mutual help and fellowship. For this reason they will need some law, by which they can be directed and rightly ordered in their of communication and fellowship.[14] This law is international law, the concept of which was advanced by Francisco de Vitoria (c.1483-1546)[15], developed by Suárez, and technically formulated by Hugo Grotius (1583-1645).

4. Suárez, theologian of religious toleration

Suárez advocated limited religious freedom. He distinguished three types of individuals who could claim entitlement to this freedom, non-apostate infidels, apostates and heretics. He allowed no freedom for the latter two types, contending that they were rebels against the authority of the Church whose subjects they were by virtue of their baptism, since "the character of baptism is the indelible sign of subjection to the Church," *character baptismi est indelebile signum subiectionis ad Ecclesiam*.[16] But freedom of worship was to be conceded to non-apostate infidels, who were not baptized and so not subject to the Church.

---

14 *De legibus seu Legislatore Deo*, lib. 2, cap. 19, n. 9 [5: 169].

15 James Brown Scott, *The Spanish Origin of International Law. I. Francisco de Vitoria and his Law of Nations*. Oxford, 1934. Sergio Moratiel Villa, "The Philosophy of International Law: Suárez, Grotius and Epigones," *International Review of the Red Cross*, no 320, pp. 539-552.

16 *De fide*, disp. 19, sect. 5, n. 6 [12: 487].

These infidels were not to be compelled to convert, for the profession of faith needs to be absolutely and entirely spontaneous, to manifest the efficacy of the divine word and grace, and to avoid pretended conversions and innumerable sacrileges. It was scandalous to suppose that adhesion to a religion that was wholly supernatural could be attained by human compulsion.[17]

These ideas were developed by an ecumenical council, Vatican II, in its Declaration of Religious Liberty, *Dignitatis humanae* (December 7, 1965), where the Catholic Church definitively consecrated the doctrine of religious freedom, in our modern age, and in words that include the following:

> the Vatican Synod declares that the human person has a right to religious freedom. This freedom consists in this, that all men need to be immune from coercion on part of singular individuals or social groups and of any human power whatsoever, and thus indeed in religious matters neither should anyone be forced to act against his conscience; nor should he be hindered, in private or in public, from acting according to his conscience, within due limits, either alone or with other persons.[18]

As the same Declaration had affirmed a little earlier, in a felicitous sentence, truth can be imposed by no force other than its own, *nec aliter veritatem sese imponere nisi vi ipsius veritatis*, a force that enters minds in a manner that is both suave and forceful.

5. Suárez, promoter of intra-Christian dialogue

Of the theologians mentioned by Pope John Paul II in his encyclical *Fides et ratio*, of September 14, 1998, Suárez is the only thinker who is said to have exerted a notable influence outside Catholicism, on Protestants, up to the middle of the 18th century. The Pope, in section

17 *De fide*, disp. 18, sect. 3, n. 6 [12: 446].

18 Vaticanum II, *Declaratio de libertate religiosa*, num. 2. *Enchiridion Vaticanum*. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 9th ed. 1971, p. 580: Haec Vaticana Synodus declarat personam humanam ius habere ad libertatem religiosam. Huiusmodi libertas in eo consistit, quod omnes homines debent immunes esse a coercitione ex parte sive singulorum sive coetuum socialium et cuiusvis potestatis humanae, et ita quidem ut in re religiosa neque quis cogatur ad agendum contra suam conscientiam neque impediatur, quominus iuxta suam conscientiam agat privatim et publice, vel solus vel aliis consociatus, intra debitos limites.

62 of this encyclical, declares that he wishes "to repeat clearly that the study of philosophy is fundamental and indispensable to the structure of theological studies." In saying this, the pontiff is in entire accord with Suárez. The latter wrote a whole treatise, the epoch-making *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, to justify it, as is apparent in the magnificent opening sentence of that work:

> *Divina et supernaturalis theologia, quanquam divino lumine principiisque a Deo revelatis nitatur, quia vero humano discursu et ratiocinatione perficitur, veritatibus etiam naturae lumine notis iuvatur, eisque ad suos discursus perficiendos, et divinas veritates illustrandas, tanquam ministris et quasi instrumentis utitur*.[19] Divine and supernatural theology, although it depends upon the divine light and on the principles revealed by God, since in fact it is completed by human discourse and reasoning, it is also aided by the truths known to the light of nature: and it employs them as ministers and instruments (as it were).

In short:

> it is not possible that anyone become a complete theologian, unless he first lays the firm foundations of metaphysics.[20]

The Pope goes on to say, referring to Suárez's great treatise:

> This method of study influenced, assisted and healed, though indirectly, the most part of the promotion of the more recent philosophy. The conspicuous example manifests the benefits that the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* of Francisco Suárez, which were found even in the German Lutheran universities.[21]

Suárez himself would have been pleased with the effect he had on Protestant thinkers—the impact, in his view, of one Catholic (himself) on other Catholics (Protestants)—for, as Pope Benedict XIV (r. 1740-1758), in his brief *Singulari vobis* of February 9, 1747, referring to a passage in Suárez, also affirms that all baptized Christians are, in a certain sense, Catholics:

---

19 *DM* proemium [25: 1].

20 *DM*, *Ad lectorem*., the very first (unnumbered) page of the work: fieri nequit ut quis theologus perfectus evadat, nisi firma prius metaphysicae iecerit fundamenta.

21 John Paul II, *Fides et ratio*, section 62. The Pope might have mentioned the Calvinist centers of learning too.

> It was discovered thereupon that he who received baptism through a heretical rite, by reason of it was made a member of the Catholic Church; the private error of the baptizer is unable to be deprived of happiness, if he confers the sacrament in the faith of the true Church, and if he respects the precepts in what pertains to the validity of baptism. Suárez admirably confirms this in his *Defense of the Catholic Faith*... where he proves that the baptized person becomes a member of the Church, and also adds that if a heretic, as often happens, purifies an infant who is unable to elicit an act of faith, this however is not an impediment which will prevent him from receiving the habit of faith through baptism.[22]

The passage which the Pope refers to contains the following lines of Suárez:

> Although none of the parents was a Catholic, by the sole baptism ritually ministered to him [the infant], and not unworthily received, he is made the member of the Catholic Church, because, through baptism, he received the justice and freedom of Christ, and together with the character of Christ; he was therefore joined to the Church, by faith in the sacrament, and by the faith of the sacrament, which is entirely sufficient for his being its member.[23]

6. Suárez, fulfiller of the Catholic Enlightenment

Suárez's enlightened views about democracy, religious tolerance and intra-Christian dialogue were reflexes of what we have called the Catholic Enlightenment, whose two principal themes were reason and freedom. We shall discuss this Enlightenment and its contrasting "Dis-Enlightenment" in more detail in Chapter 2.

But reason (and its corollary freedom) is understood differently in the two Enlightenments. Catholic reason is not the autonomous fac-

---

22 Benedict XIV, *Singulari vobis*, (Feb. 9, 1749) § 13. Denzinger-Hünnermann, 2567.

23 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*, lib 1, cap 24, n. 2 [24: 117]: Immo quamvis nullus ex parentibus esset Catholicus, per solum baptismum rite ministratum, et non indigne receptum, factus esset Ecclesiae Catholicae membrum, quia veram iustitiam et fidem Christi per baptismum accepit, simul cum Christi charactere; ergo coniunctus fuit Ecclesiae per sacramentum fidei, et per fidem sacramenti, quod satis omnino est ut fuerit membrum eius.

ulty, divorced from revelation, of the Age of Reason: rather, its natural light is transfigured by the supernatural light of faith. Yet reason is able by its own power to consolidate the foundations of theology, because it explains and confirms those natural principles which encompass all things, and in some way support and sustain all doctrine. Both reason and freedom are intimately connected, because freedom rises from the intelligence; and appetite follows knowledge (contained in the intelligence); and hence a more perfect appetite (the will, which yearns for freedom) follows from more perfect knowledge (and its container, intelligence). Now the intellect acts with a certain indifference towards its objects, in that it is not constrained to accord equal value to all that it knows. It judges about ends and means, weighs what in them is good or bad, useful or useless, what is and is not needed to achieve ends; only the truth compels it.

So too the appetite, or will, that follows from this knowledge acts with a certain indifference; it is not necessitated to accept all the good that is presented to it, but only relative to the importance that any particular good is judged to have; only the divine good compels it. All other good that is not necessary is therefore accepted or desired freely. Rational deliberation is followed by free choice, *ad rationalem consultationem sequitur electio libera*.[24]

The Catholic Enlightenment had far more numerous followers than the Dis-Enlightenment, and by far the more brilliant intellects. Among the forerunners of the movement are the queen Isabel la Católica (1451-1504), and the Dominicans Pedro de Córdoba (1482-1525) and Bartolomé de las Casas (1484-1566). As a disciplined intellectual movement making use of the Scholastic method, the Catholic Enlightenment is represented by the theologians of Salamanca, including the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (c. 1483-1546), the movement's Scholastic inaugurator, and its completer the Jesuit Francisco Suárez.

7. Suárez, inspirer of freedom movements

Western polities, directly or indirectly, experienced the power of the Catholic Enlightenment in the form given it by Suárez. That power, in 1640, energized the Portuguese to revolt against sixty years of Spanish domination: the ideologue of the revolt was the insurgent lawyer

24 *DM* 19: 2: 17 [25: 698].

Francisco de gouveia (c. 1580-1659), whose *Just Acclamation of King João IV* cites Suárez (15 times) to the effect that human political authority comes from God, and is invested in the community and not in kings; and that kings acting tyrannically can be deposed.

That power was infused into the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England, by John Locke (1632-1704), but indirectly (if at all), through his revered mentor Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) one of Suárez's most fervent admirers. Like Suárez Locke maintained that people, not kings, are the source of power; that people form governments to protect their rights; and that the government that fails to protect those rights can be replaced. Only Suárez did not use Locke's language of the "inalienable rights" of all men, though he would have agreed with the concept.

Inspirited by Locke, and perhaps also by Suárez, Jefferson composed his eloquent *Declaration of Independence* in 1776. The thought of Suárez could have been channeled through the Catholic signatory to that *Declaration*, Charles Carroll (1737-1832). A lawyer, Carroll was a close associate of the Founding Fathers of the U. S.; he had been trained by Jesuits in Europe in their centers of learning that promoted Suárez's thought.

That thought—in a country conditioned by Jesuit education, British political thinking, and by political theorists like Montesquieu (1689-1755) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)—appears to have percolated down to the French Revolution, inspiring documents on the Rights of Man of 1789 and the French Constitution of 1791.

Finally, the Grito de Dolores of 1810, the cry of Mexican independence, was raised in a continent dominated by the ideas of Suárez, by a priest and professor of philosophy Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla (1753-1811) who had studied under the Jesuits and could not fail to be acquainted with the notion of freedom of their greatest theologian.

IV. SUÁREZ, FOUNDER OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY

1. Suarezian vocabulary as groundwork for modern philosophy

Our question is: *how did Suárez come to be the founder of modern philosophy?* We shall be dealing with this problem in detail in Chapters 5, 6 and 7, below, but a brief statement will be in order at this stage of our discourse.

It is generally agreed that modern philosophy places greater stress on the subjectivity of the knower than on the objective reality of the known, as does medieval philosophy. Suárez, when faced with a basic problem of metaphysics, whether the concept of "being" is one or multiple, decided, without any Scholastic precedent, to make a subjective state of mind (*conceptus formalis entis*) the criterion for establishing the unitary sense of objective reality (*conceptus obiectivus entis*). When problems like that of "being" became too difficult to resolve by the usual medieval "objective" approach, Suárez recommended recourse to the "subjective" because it was better known (*notior*) to us than the objective, especially as the subjective is produced "by us and in us" (*a nobis et in nobis*). On the basis of the principle that "to one formal concept one objective concept necessarily corresponds," *uni conceptui formali unus conceptus obiectivus necessario respondet*, Suárez, as never before in Scholasticism, made extra-mental reality dependent for its truth on an intra-mental concept, thus changing the main thrust of medieval philosophy. Descartes adopted the same approach when faced with the basic problem of his system, of establishing, through the resources of the intellect, knowledge that was objectively certain. Like Suárez, he made an intra-mental concept the criterion for determining extra-mental reality. The intra-mental concept was the thinker's "*cogito*"; the extra-mental reality was the thinker's existence, "*sum*"; with the certainty of the existence following as a necessary consequence, "*ergo*", from the intra-mental concept itself.

Suárez could not have become the founder of modern philosophy before he had worked out his own system, the technical vocabulary of which provided the groundwork for the emerging modern systems. This vocabulary was first needed to systematize metaphysics. The long subjection to the unmethodical text of Aristotle had delayed the at-

tainment of this important philosophical object, realised at last in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*.

In the two volumes of that great work, the philosophy of being was given a binary structure, characterized, though not by its author, as general (vol. 1) and special (vol. 2) metaphysics. *General metaphysics* has as its theme the common concept of being, its general attributes, and its causes; and *special metaphysics*, the kinds of being contained under the common concept,[25] classified in two dichotomies, the primary of finite and infinite, and the secondary of substance and accident. Suárez also furnished the burgeoning modern systems with vocabulary as groundwork for their ideas, in many cases the vocabulary anomalously grew to be alien to the system that was its source. How was this possible? Through that system undergoing *anamorphosis*, a condition where something distorted occasionally appears to be regular; indeed so regular, that the distorted ideas seem to belong to the nature of anamorphosed thing itself. Which may explain why the realist Suárez is made out to be a crypto-idealist, and it may be that the philosophies of realism (Scholasticism) and idealism (modern philosophies) have some hidden affinity and are closer together than one would suppose.

2. The formal and objective concepts

The Suarezian system is a complex construct described in Chapter 2. It is the last, and arguably the consummate system predicated on the unquestioned truth of cognitive realism, the doctrine that things exist independently of any conscious being having knowledge of them. It operates on a carefully crafted vocabulary, specific to itself, but one flexible enough, when modified through anamorphosis, to seem to be the natural expression of alien styles of philosophical thinking like ra-

25 Suárez describes *general* metaphysics and its "propriam et adaequatam rationem, ac deinde proprietates eius et causas." *DM* 2: 1, introductory paragraph [25: 64] "… de communi conceptu entis, illiusque proprietatibus, quae de illa reciproce dicuntur." *DM* 28, introductory paragraph [26: 1]. He describes *special* metaphysics as "res omnes, quae sub ente continentur, et illius rationem includunt, et sub obiectiva ratione huius scientiae cadunt, et a materia in suo esse abstrahunt." *DM* 2: 1, introductory paragraph [25: 64] "… definitas rationes entium… divisiones varias ipsius entis et membrorum eius… primam et maxime essentialem divisionem entis in finitum et infinitum secundum essentiam seu in ratione entis." *DM* 28, introductory paragraph [26: 1].

tionalism and empiricism. This vocabulary can be classified into two main groups on the basis of the Suarezian double concept, the formal and the objective. The distinction between them had been evolving from around the 14th century; it attained its definitive form with the uncompromising realist Suárez, who adopted a threefold method in elaborating it: the definition of the concept in question; a discussion of its significance; and an assessment of its character. An analysis of this method follows.

First, the **formal concept**.[26] Its *definition*: "the very act... or word by which the intellect conceives of some thing or common significance."[27] When, for example, we think of "man", the act which we produce in the mind in thinking of man is known as the formal concept.

The *significance of the formal concept* is described as follows: it is a concept, because it is conceived by the mind, and is its offspring, so to speak. It is formal," either because it is the last form of the mind, or because it formally represents the known thing to the mind, or because it is the intrinsic term of mental conception, in which it differs from the objective concept."[28]

The *character of the formal concept*: "The formal concept is a true and positive thing, and, in the creature, the quality inhering in the mind... [it is] a singular and indivisible thing, because it is a thing produced by the intellect."[29]

Next, the **objective concept**. Its *definition*: "That thing, or reason which is properly and immediately known or represented through the formal concept. [An example is] man known and represented in that act."[30]

---

26 José Hellin, "El concepto formal según Suárez." *Pensamiento* 18 (1962), pp. 407-432.

27 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 64]: actus ipse, seu… verbum quo intellectus rem aliquam seu communem rationem concipit.

28 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65]: vel quia est ultima forma mentis, vel quia formaliter repraesentat menti rem cognitam, vel quia est intrinsecus terminus conceptionis mentalis, in quo differt a conceptu obiectivo.

29 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 64]: formalis semper est vera ac positiva res et in creatura qualitas menti inhaerens.... res singularis et indivisa, quia est res producta per intellectum.

30 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65]: res illa, vel ratio quae proprie et immediate per conceptum formalem cognoscitur vel repraesentatur. [An example is] homo... cognitus et repraesentatus in actu illo.

Significance of the objective concept: It is a concept "by extrinsic denomination from the formal concept, by which its object is said to be conceived."[31] It is objective, "because it is not a concept as a form intrinsically terminating a conception, but as the object and matter about which the formal concept is concerned, and to which the keenness of the mind directly tends."[32]

Lastly, the *character of the objective concept*. An objective concept "in fact is not always a positive thing, but may include privations and negations, and such, which are called 'beings of reason', because they have their being objectively in the intellect… sometimes indeed it can be a singular and individual thing, in so far as it can be placed before the mind, and conceived by a formal act. Frequently however it is a universal, con-fused or common thing, such as man, substance and the like."[33] The objective concept is thus characterized by heterogeneity of content, which contrasts with the simple unity of the formal.

The objective "concept" can have two interpretations, realist and idealist. The idealist sense, conformable to Descartes but not intended by Suárez, is that all that we know is concepts and not the things they represent. The realist sense, assumed by Suárez, is that the objective concept is primarily about things that have reality independently of the mind, and with ideas that have reality only in the mind (like negations, privations and relations). However, all that we know, we know through concepts. There is a difference between knowing *through* concepts (realism) and knowing *concepts* (idealism). We have described this comprehensive mode of human knowledge by the neologism "omniconceptualism."

---

31 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65].

32 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65]: per denominationem extrinsecam a conceptu formali, per quem obiectum eius concipi dicitur, et ideo recte dicitur obiectivus, quia non est conceptus ut forma intrinsece terminans conceptionem, sed ut obiectum et materia circa quam versatur formalis conceptus, et ad quam mentis acies directe tendit...

33 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65]: obiectivus vero non semper est vera res positiva; concipimus enim interdum privationes, et alia, quae vocantur entia rationis, quia solum habent esse obiective in intellectu... interdum quidem esse potest res singularis et individua, quatenus menti obiici potest, et per actum formalem concipi; saepe vero est res universalis vel confusa et communis, ut est homo, substantia, et similia.

3. Suarezian themes of the formal concept

We may now classify the themes, taken from Suárez, that were of assistance to modern philosophers in developing their ideas.

The former category, the *conceptus formalis*, has the following five themes: omniconceptualism, intra-mental criteria for extra-mental reality, criteria for certainty, elimination of demonic deception, and innate ideas. These themes may be described as follows.

First, Suárez's inclusion of all of reality under the rubric of "concept" (what can be "conceived," but in a realist sense) may be conveniently characterized by the neologism "*omniconceptualism*."[34] That all knowledge is conceptual (what can be "conceived," in an ideational sense) will be succintly affirmed by Leibniz when he declares that the object of metaphysics is "conceivability" or *cogitabilitas*.

Second, Suárez's proposing (in one instance) *the intra-mental as the criterion for discerning extra-mental reality*,[35] (as in resolving) the basic understanding of being. In so doing he initiated a shift of focus from the Scholastic extra-mental to the intra-mental of the modern philosophies. The conclusion, that the objective concept of being was also unitary was thus established on the basis of a subjective mental act, so affirming the preeminence of consciousness over being, a basic postulate of modern philosophies. Through the formula *Cogito ergo sum*, Descartes indicated how a knowledge of an indubitable extra-mental reality (*sum*) was made dependent (*ergo*) on an indubitable intra-mental consciousness (*Cogito*).

Third, Suárez uses the same or similar terms as Descartes to describe the *criteria for certainty*.[36] Suárez has five terms: "clear, distinct, evident, perfect," open." Descartes prefers the terms "clear" and "distinct." The difference is that the Suarezian criteria apply to the humble human intellect, while the Cartesian do to that intellect raised (as we shall see) to the level of the angelic.

Fourth, Suárez understands that the certainty established by natural means on the human level needs to be corroborated on the more potent superhuman level, by the *elimination of demonic deception*.[37] While Suárez believes that a malevolent intelligence or angel cannot

34 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 64-65].

35 *DM* 2: 2 [25: 70-81].

36 *DM* 8: 3: 18 [25: 288].

37 *DM* 9: 2: 7 [25: 323].

necessitate the intellect to a false assent, Descartes has a greater fear of an evil genius, supremely powerful and clever, who could conceivably direct his entire effort at deceiving Descartes.

Fifth, Suárez, describing the intellect of an angel, declares that *innate ideas*,[38] or ideas not derived from any connection with the fallible and untrustworthy senses, are implanted in the angelic mind by nature and by God. Descartes, desirous of making the human mind impervious to sense-induced error, seeks to give man the mind of an angel. This is the start of what is taken to be the hybris of modern philosophy, and its consequent plunge into chaos.

4. Suarezian themes of the objective concept

To the second member of the binary, the *conceptus obiectivus*, belong the following five themes: the three types of distinction, substance and modes, disproportion between matter and spirit, individuation, and the optimal universe. To examine these in turn:

First, Suárez classifies *three types of distinction: real, conceptual, and modal*. [39]Broadly, the types of distinction are two, conceptual and real. *Conceptual* distinctions are devices which the human mind (the feeblest kind of the intellect in existence in the universe) employs to make sense of a reality that it cannot grasp at once. In order that it understand a thing distinctly and clearly, it attributes to the thing many predicates distinct in reality or in concept.[40] *Real* distinctions are of two kinds, major (or real proper) and minor, or modal. When entities are separable, and each can exist without the other, they exemplify the major real distinction. When an entity can exist without another, but the latter cannot exist without the former, we have the minor real, or modal, distinction. A man can exist without running, but if he runs, his running is inseparable from him even by divine power. Running is a mode of the substance man. Descartes makes use of this distinction

38 In angels, *De angelis,* lib. 2, cap. 5, n. 20 [2: 121]; [**further references to** *De angelis* **are numerical only**], not in humans, *De angelis* 2: 7: 3 [2: 135].

39 *DM* 7, *De variis distinctionum generibus* [25: 245-274].

40 *DM* 8: 3: 18 [25: 288]: Intellectus noster per unum simplicem conceptum non concipit adaequate, neque exhaurit distincte et clare rem conceptam... postquam aliquo modo confuse et inadaequate illam concipit, ut illam distincte et adaequate cognoscat, illi attribuit plura praedicata sive re sive ratione distincta.

to established his dualism, and Spinoza (1632-1677) to argue for his monism.

Second, *substance and modes*.[41] Suárez, like philosophers who are concerned with reality's perplexing multiplicity, arranges it in predicaments through which the multiplicity can be controlled. The most renowned classification into predicaments is that of Aristotle (384-322 BC), which is broadly binary, substance and accidents; but "accidents" have 9 subdivisions, with the result that there are in all 10 predicaments. Philosophers like Thomas Aquinas (c.1225-1274) advance a priori reasons for the comprehensive character of the Aristotelian predicaments, but Suárez finds these reasons arbitrary and faulty, and concludes that an a priori classification can be comprehensive only when it is a binary, of two contradictorily opposed members. Suárez himself did not propose such a classification as a substitute for the Aristotelian decade; but one of his groupings, the binary of substance and modes, was taken as the substitute by Descartes, Malebranche (1638-1715) and (in particular) Spinoza—who leaned on it to resolve his problem of the One (substance) and the Many (modes).

Third, *the disproportion between matter and spirit*.[42] Suárez states that a material thing cannot act on spirit, because there is no proportion between those two kinds of entity, and that a material object cannot produce a spiritual form by its natural powers, because it belongs to a totally inferior order. He takes this disproportion as proof that the angel's mind cannot acquire its knowledge of material reality from that reality, but needs to have that knowledge innate in the angel's mind, infused there directly by God. How then, given the disproportion, can the human intellect work with material sensations? By the fact that both the immaterial cognitions of that intellect, and the material sensations at its disposal, derive from the human soul which is the form of the human body. This corporeal connection downgrades the human intellect to proportion its activity to the actions of the body. But the angel's intellect has no connection whatever with any material body, and so remains totally separate from everything material. As Descartes rejects the Scholastic theory that the human soul is the form of the body, and contends that thought (mind) and extension (body)

41 *DM* 33-36 [26: 329-491].

42 *De angelis*, 2: 7: 10 [2: 128].

are wholly unrelated, his human person becomes a dual unintegrated entity.

Fourth, *individuation*.[43] Suárez declares, and Descartes and Leibniz agree, that whatever exists in reality is singular, and is individuated by its own entity. For Suárez however, no complete created entity is free from composition; the only simple entity is God. But Leibniz postulates the existence of innumerable created entities simple in structure, all working harmoniously according to a divinely pre-established plan. These are the monads.

Fifth, *the optimal universe*.[44] Suárez, like many Scholastics, accepts the theory that the present universe is perfect, because God is a perfect cause, and a perfect cause can only have a perfect effect. But the Scholastic perfection is typical, while the Leibnizian is individual. In other words the Scholastic universe is perfect in the sense that it possesses all the types of divine perfection (existent in God formally or eminently) as are imitable by created things, such as mineral, plant, animal, human and angelic. But Leibniz's universe is perfect in that each individual in it is perfect according to its capacity. He contends that God cannot act without a reason or prefer the less perfect to the more perfect.

Suárez seems to have had an uncanny sense of the possible anamorphic distortion of his thought, and to have taken precautions against it by his anticipated refutations of some of the main tenets of the modern philosophers: such as the dualism of Descartes, the monism of Spinoza and the monadism of Leibniz (see Chapter 6).

Anamorphosis of the Suarezian concepts we have listed above was generally a rationalist phenomenon and rarely an empiricist one. The Suarezian concepts taken over by the empiricists retained much of their original character, such as the basic importance of experience (empiricists); the primacy of the singular (empiricists, Glisson); the distinction between existence and subsistence (Berkeley); the conceptualist view of the universals (Locke); the dual meaning of essence (Locke); and the analogy between God and creation (Berkeley). The one Suarezian concept that underwent anamorphosis at the empircist's hands was that of substance and modes, that after a prolonged degradation was eventually eliminated by Hume.

---

43 *DM* 6: 2: 2 [25: 206], *DM* 5: 6: 1 [25: 180].

44 *DM* 33: 1: 8 [26: 332].

In sum: the thought of Suárez anamorphosed gave rise to modern philosophy. The judge destined to preside at the Last Judgment of immemorial realist philosophies and to rule on their distortions had to suffer the indignity of affecting the emergent idealisms through a distortion of his own ideas. However, by retaining their original character these ideas produced the Suarezian super-system, combining two syntheses, the theological and the philosophical. We shall first be dealing with the theological synthesis as linked with the philosophical (Chapter 1) and in then concentrate on the philosophical synthesis alone (Chapter 2).

CHAPTER I
BAROQUE SCHOLASTICISM & ITS CONSUMMATOR SUÁREZ

I. FOUNDATIONS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY
1. Inquiry into Christian doctrine
2. Methodical classification of Christian doctrines
3. Investigation into theology's philosophical foundations

II. SYSTEMATIZATION OF THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
1. Theological synthesis: commentarial method
2. Theological synthesis: organic method
3. Philosophical synthesis: commentarial method
4. Philosophical synthesis: organic method

III. SYSTEMATIC INTEGRATION OF THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
1. The Suarezian super-system
2. The formation of other super-systems on the Suarezian model

We have argued that the system of Suárez was the most comprehensive of the Baroque, indeed Catholic, systems, and that, in addition it was a "super-system", that is, two systems, philosophical and theological, integrated into a single architectonic structure, the work of a single author. The corroboration of these claims is the intention of the present chapter. We shall present, in schematic form, the evolution of the systematization of Christian theology and philosophy up to its climactic moment in the work of Suárez.

The history of Catholic thought, up to that climactic moment will be divided into eleven phases. Phases 1 to 5 will be discussed briefly, for without them the Baroque achievement cannot be properly evaluated; more attention will be given to phases 6 to 11, the Baroque achievement itself.

I. FOUNDATIONS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

1. Inquiry into Christian doctrine

Christian theology begins with the Fathers, the teachers of the orthodox faith of the first seven centuries of the Christian era. Men of ethnic and temperamental diversity, they were one in their concern to preserve the unity and integrity of the Christian believers. In their time the basic teachings of Christianity were in the crucible of formation. As occasion demanded, the many aspects of Christian doctrine were clarified and evaluated, in response to particular challenges that the author and the Church felt themselves called upon to face—challenges made manifest in the distortional and divisive expressions of the Christian message that came to be known as "heresies." Nevertheless, even in this time of the unavoidably occasional and discrete discussion of the themes of Christian doctrine, when it appeared that some degree of a mature appreciation of them had been attained, an urge was felt to see these themes comprehensively, how each of them stood in relation to the others in an overall pattern, with the unity of doctrine thus corresponding to the unity of the believers. In other words, the Fathers were occupied with fashioning the building blocks of Christian belief, which they sometimes, prematurely, yearned to assemble into an elegant and majestic structure. This brings us to the second phase of our evolution, the creation of a Christian systematic theology.

2. Methodical classification of Christian doctrines

A theological system is an assemblage of interdependent doctrines forming a complex, ordered, comprehensive and unitary whole. Its basic pattern is tripartite: the *doctrines* themselves; classified under foundational *categories* ; and all reduced to and derived from a *controlling idea*. In theology, this idea is "God". For the system to possess an elegant symmetry, each doctrine, in its primary meaning, must be subsumed under one category only, else its treatment will be redundant. However, in its secondary meanings, the doctrine may be affiliated to other categories without redundancy.

The first theologian who sought to construct a Christian systematics was Origen (c. 185-c. 254), in his work, *The First Principles* (prior to 231). Its four books classify the doctrines of Christianity under four categories, each assigned a book. The categories are God, the world, man and Scripture. But the classification of the doctrines under these categories is somewhat untidy and redundant. For instance, the book on God also discusses themes like rational creatures, corporeal and incorporeal beings, and angels, which do not strictly belong to the topic; and the book on the world deals with material irrelevant to the theme like the Incarnation and God as the author of the Two Testaments. The books on man and Scripture generally contain pertinent material.

The next classifier of doctrine was Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-386?). In the 18 lectures of his *Catechesis* (350), doctrines are sorted in five sections: baptism, penitence and faith (lectures 1-5), the Father (6-9), the Son (10-16), the Holy Spirit (17), and the resurrection, the Catholic Church and eternal life (18). Not an ideal classification, one that sandwiches the Trinity between baptism and the Catholic Church.

A better classification, neat, logical, but not comprehensive, is that of Gregory of Nyssa (c. 335-c. 394). In the Prologue to his *Great Catechesis* (385), Gregory clearly affirms the need for a systematic exposé of the Christian doctrine. The book's 40 chapters may be divided into three sections: Divine Unity and Trinity (chapters 1-4); the Incarnation, cause of man's regeneration (5-32); and the sacraments, the means to regeneration (33-40). Here, in inchoate form, we have the pattern that will be adopted by the medieval and Baroque Scholastics.

A more exhaustive treatment of Christian doctrine, but lacking a clear logical pattern is that of Theodoret (c. 393-c. 458), in the fifth part of his book *Discourses on the Fables of the Heretics*, entitled "Epitome of the Divine Dogmas" (c. 435). This part has 29 chapters that can be arranged into eight sections: God (the Trinity, chapters 1-2), the Creator (4-9), Providence (10), the Redeemer (11-15), the Divine Attributes (16-17), Miscellaneous Topics (baptism, the Last Things, etc., 18-23), sexual morality (24-27), and penitence and abstinence (28-29). Logically, it would seem that the place of the "Divine Attributes" is properly after "God" rather than after the "Redeemer."

The last Greek theologian of the Patristic age was John Damascene (c. 675-749), author of the *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, the third part of his monumental work, *The Fountain of Knowledge* (c. 743). The 100 chapters of the *Exposition* are conventionally divided into four books, on the model of the *Sentences* of a later, Western, theologian, Peter Lombard; the first three generally follow a logical pattern—God, Creator, Incarnation. But the fourth book is a medley of miscellaneous topics (like faith, baptism, prayer towards the East, Mary, etc.). The *Exposition* is really a lengthy commentary on the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (325), a tripartite confession of faith in the Trinity. For John, all the doctrines pertinent to salvation can be classified under this fundamental dogma of the Christian faith.

After a lapse of four centuries the task of finding a logical and comprehensive pattern for Christian theology was taken up again, this time by Western theologians, two of the most significant being Hugh of St. Victor and the above-mentioned Peter Lombard. For Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141) all of theology is sacramental, for the history of salvation is resumed in the institution of the sacraments, announcers of the experience of the Beatific Vision. Hugh's work, *De sacramentis* (c. 1140), is divided into two parts, each assigned a book—*opus conditionis* (the work of creation) and *opus restaurationis* (the work of restoration). But there is some confusion and redundancy in the treatment. In Book 1, discussion on "creation" precedes that of "God" Himself, and describes topics connected more with *restauratio* than with *conditio* (like the sacraments, faith and law). Book 2 is more logically organized: it deals, in order, with the Incarnation, the Church, the sacraments and final beatitude, but it also interjects a discussion of virtues and vices after the sacraments of matrimony and the orders.

Peter Lombard (c. 1100-1164?), the *Magister Sententiarum*, established the definitive pattern of Christian systematics in his *Book of the Sentences* (or *Authoritative Decisions*, 1148-1151). The categorization in this work, free of redundancy, is into four topics, each assigned a book. The categories are God (the Trinity, book 1), creation (of the world and man, as well as his Fall, book 2), restoration (the uplifting of man by the grace of the Incarnation, book 3), and sacraments (the means of the uplift, book 4). This pattern, with some modifications, was adopted by the medieval and Baroque Scholastics, who described Lombard as *magister, repletus sapientia de supernis* (Bonaventure) and

as the *totius divinae sapientiae sacrarium* (Frassen). Yet Lombard's treatise was no more than a skillful selection of Patristic texts appositely assembled, strong on authority and weak on dialectics. It was, in other words, a work of "positive" theology, the record of established Christian doctrines determined by Revelation and Tradition, mostly as expounded by Augustine (354-430), doctrines to which Scholasticism was to apply the processes of reasoning and argumentation, thus creating systems of speculative philosophy and theology.

3. Investigation into theology's philosophical foundations

Merely classifying doctrines did not suit the Scholastics; they wanted to inquire into their rational content, to probe into the intelligibility of the concepts constituting each doctrine, and their correspondence with the intelligibility of the other doctrines. To realize such an objective, logic would need to be applied to the truths of faith, an approach that was viewed with disfavor by such theologians as the *Doctor Mellifluuus* Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153). But the movement to the dialectical transmutation of theology was irreversible. The *Doctor Magnificus* Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) was the first to successfully incorporate the rationalism of dialectics into theology, thus helping to create the Scholastic method; a method further elaborated by Peter Abelard (1079-1142), whose belief that logic could be applied to the truths of faith was in opposition to the mysticism of Bernard.

To perfect this philosophical transformation of theology, the medievals turned for guidance to the only philosophical tradition known to them, the ancient Greek, as represented by its two mighty luminaries, Plato (427?-347 BC), and Aristotle (384-322 BC). The medieval thinkers had two choices: between, on the one hand, the imaginative, poetic and idealist Plato, whose philosophy had inspired many of the Fathers; and on the other, Aristotle, the "Philosopher," empirical, systematic and comprehensive, whose *oeuvre*—comprising treatises on physics, natural history, psychology, ethics, logic, metaphysics and aesthetics—seemed to medieval thinkers to be the very embodiment of total human knowledge. Though their heritage was loaded with Platonic influences mediated through Augustine and Dionysius, the medievals chose, as their mentor, Aristotle, the creator of the logical and critical tools for philosophical analysis, like the syllogism. These

tools enabled the medievals to transform theology into a "science," that is, an axiomatic deductive system consisting of self-evident principles and general truths, from which conclusions or theorems could be inferred. Few medieval thinkers could read the Philosopher in the original. There was a Latin translation of one of the latter's books by Boethius (c. 475-525), but translations of more works were available from around 1150. Standards of translation became increasingly higher, and guided by them the Flemish Dominican translator, William of Moerbeke (c. 1215-1286) completed the Latin Aristotelian corpus between 1255 and 1278.

In addition to Aristotle's works, the medievals had at their disposal translations of the erudite commentaries of Muhammadan philosophers like Al-Farabi (c. 878-c.950), Avicenna/Ibn Sina (980-1037), and, best of all, Averroes/Ibn Rushd (1126-1198), revered as "The Commentator" par excellence. Averroes analyzed and reconstructed Aristotle's work with a fine scholarly and philosophical sense. Inspired by the Muslim example, and intending to demonstrate Aristotelianism's basic soundness and its compatibility with Christian theology, the Latins themselves—like Robert Grosseteste (c. 1175-1253) and Roger Bacon (c. 1214-1294?)—wrote commentaries on some of the Stagirite's works. The *Doctor Universalis* Albertus Magnus (c. 1200-1280) commented on them all.

But the most excellent commentators on Aristotle were the Dominican *Doctor Angelicus* Thomas Aquinas (1225?-1274) and the Franciscan *Doctor Subtilis* John Duns Scotus (c. 1265-1308), who commented on some, not all, of the Philosopher's works. Their glosses were greatly valued by the Renaissance and Baroque commentators, who commented on the commentaries of these illustrious Doctors.

Renaissance and Baroque Thomist (Dominican) supercommentators:
CAJETAN (1468-1534) commentaries published 1496-1498
FRANCISCO DE ARAÚJO (1580-1664), commentaries published 1617-1631
Scotist Renaissance (Franciscan) supercommentaries (commentaries on Scotus' commentaries of Aristotle)
ANTONIO DE ARAGÓN, *Metaphysics* (1495)
JEROME GADIUS, MAURICIO DE PORTU
JOANNES MINERIUS, PIERRE TATARET, *Physics* (1495)

II. SYSTEMATIZATION OF THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY

1. Theological synthesis: commentarial method

With the philosophical techniques of Aristotle mastered, medieval theologians were able to establish a unifying speculative nexus between the doctrines positively formulated by Lombard. The Big Three of medieval theology, Bonaventure, Aquinas and Scotus, constructed symmetrically ordered systems whose architectonic design recalls that of the contemporary Gothic cathedrals. However, in structuring their theologies, these thinkers adopted the relatively inelastic and inorganic commentarial method, where an author seeks not to express his own thought, but to clarify that of another, in the process often distorting the latter's ideas, while not seldom being unfaithful to his own.

Still, within the limits of the commentary as a literary form, the text of the author commented on could suggest fresh ideas, even strikingly original ones, construable as being further developments of the commented text, and not only not at variance, but indeed in total harmony with it. Bonaventure's interpretation of the overall structure of Lombard's synthesis can be taken as an example of such a compatible commentary. In the four books of the *Magister Sententiarum* (indicated by the numbers below), Bonaventure discovers four "profundities":

> 1. *Sublimitas esse divini* (profundum aeternae emanationis): the Trinity, and God's creative power
> 2. *Vanitas esse creati* (profundum creationis): the creation of the world, of man, and his Fall
> 3. *Meritum Christi* (profundum incarnationis): the passion, whereby Christ redeems man, and the action by which He molds him through virtues and gifts
> 4. *Sacramentalis dispensatio* (profundum sacramentalis dispensationis et efficacii perfecti medicamenti): the healing of fallen man through the sacraments and his resultant experience of glory.

It is interesting to examine another interpretation of Lombard's structure, this time that of a Baroque Scotist, Claude Frassen (1620-1711). The theme of the *Sentences*, declares Frassen, is the Godhead, *divinitas*, manifested in four aspects (each having a book assigned to it)—God, Nature, Grace and Glory. In more precise terms, God manifests Himself.

1. In ordine *Divinitatis*, subsistentem, operantem et producentem
2. Juxta *Naturae* ordinem, creaturas producentem, moderantem et ordinantem
3. Secundum supernaturalem *Gratiae* ordinem, hominum salutem in humanitate assumpta mediantem et molientem
4. Denique ad ordinem *Gloriae* per sacramenta, tanquam per media necessaria et efficacia deducentem

For the followers of Bonaventure and Scotus, Lombard's treatise, as commented on by their founders, continued to be their theological textbook well into the Baroque age, for the Bonaventurians at least until 1622, and for the Scotists until as late as 1702. Bonaventurians and Scotists continued to write supercommentaries on the commentaries of their masters. (Among the Scotists, Brancatus a Lauria was particularly renowned for elegance of style and amplitude of thought.) As for the followers of Aquinas, they do not appear to have commented on his Commentary on the *Sentences*, for their founder had struck a new path, creating a fresh and organic synthesis of Catholic theology.

The Three Doctors

BONAVENTURE, *Doctor Seraphicus* (1221-1274), *Commentary on the Sentences* (1250-1253)

AQUINAS, *Doctor Angelicus* vel *Communis* (1225?-1274), *Commentary on the Sentences* (1254-1256)

SCOTUS, *Doctor Subtilis* (1265?-1308), *Opus Oxoniense* (c. 1300)

Bonaventurian supercommentaries, from 1484-1622 (138 years). At least 4. All Franciscan

GUILLAUME VURILONGUS (c. 1390/94-1463), Commentator on Bonaventure and Scotus (1484)

ETIENNE BRULIFER (+1499), *Commentary on* the four books of Bonaventure's *Sentences* (1501)

CAPULEUS CORTONENSIS. *Commentary* on two books of Bonaventure's *Sentences* (1622)

Thomist supercommentaries, Dominican

JOANNES CAPREOLUS (c. 1380-1440). *Libri Defensionum Theologiae Divi Doctoris Thomae de Aquino in Libros Sententiarum*, 4 vol. (1432)

Scotist supercommentaries, 1480-1702 (222 years). At least 31. All Franciscan

FRANCISCUS LYCHETUS (+1520), copious commentary on the first three books (1517)

PHILIPPUS FABER (1564-1630), condensed commentary on the four books (1610)

LAURENTIUS BRANCATUS A LAURIA (1612-1693), commentary on the four books of Scotus's *Sentences*, in 8 volumes (1652)

MARINUS PANGER, commentary on selected questions of the four books (1702)

2. Theological synthesis: organic method

The new path was that of creating a comprehensive synthesis of the content of theology, in other words, a *summa*, free of the commentarial method. The first large-scale effort in this direction was that of the Franciscan Alexander of Hales, the *Doctor Irrefragabilis* (c. 1170/85-1245) and of his followers, in their *Summa Theologica* (c.1236-1245...). This work, also the first systematic exposition of Christian doctrine to introduce Aristotle as a prime authority, consists of three books. The first, in two parts, deals with the divine Unity and Trinity. The second book, also in two parts, discusses evil (part 1) and sin (part 2). The third book has no unitary theme, and is in three parts. Part 1 is on the Incarnation, Part 2 on Laws and Precepts, and Part 3 on Grace and Virtues. The last two parts do not seem to have a direct bearing on the first. The work also suffers from over-classification, leaving the reader lost in a maze of divisions and subdivisions.

With all its defects, Alexander's treatise was based on the organic method, where the author is responsible for the entire content of his work, its overall pattern and its textual elaboration. Alexander was succeeded in the enterprise of creating an organic synthesis by the two titans of medieval theology, Bonaventure and Aquinas. In his *Breviloquium*, composed before 1257, Bonaventure, the *Doctor Seraphicus*, classified the entire material of Catholic theology under a scheme that is at once triple and septuple; triple in principle and septuple in theme. The triple principle is God, effective, refective and perfective. The seven themes are subsumed under this triple principle as follows:

Principium effectivum (*creatio*): 1) Trinitas, 2) creatura mundi

Principium refectivum (*redemptio*): 3) corruptela peccati, 4) Incarnatio Verbi, 5) gratia Spiritus Sancti, 6) medicina sacramentalis

Principium perfectivum (*retributio*): 7) status finalis judicii

Alas, the Seraphic Doctor did not subject this elegant pattern to any extensive and detailed treatment, as Alexander of Hales had done.

It was left to Aquinas, the *Doctor Angelicus*, to work out a system that both contained a detailed treatment of the material of theology, and an architectonic pattern that reduced this material to order. The resultant synthesis was elaborated in two stages, first, in his ample *Summa Contra Gentiles* (c. 1258-1264) and then in his monumental *Summa Theologiae* (1267-1273). The scheme of the former work, in four books, is as follows:

1. *Deus secundum seipsum* (God in Himself)
2. *Processus creaturarum a Deo* (God as efficient cause)
3. *Ordo creaturarum in Deo sicut in finem* (God as final cause)
4. *Hominis cognitio de divinis* (man's knowledge of divine things)

The fourth theme does not seem to follow from the third; indeed, its proper place would appear to have been at the beginning.

More satisfactory, and elaborate in detail is the *Summa Theologiae*, distributed under 512 questions, in three parts, the second part having two subdivisions. The first part is about God in Himself and as efficient cause. The remaining two parts deal with God as final cause. The second part is subdivided into the *Prima Secundae* and the *Secunda Secundae*. The former is concerned with man and his moral acts in general; the latter, with man's moral acts in particular, that is with virtues and vices. The third part has the Incarnation as its unitary idea; consequent upon it is the Redemption, the salvific means provided by the Redeemer (the sacraments), and the effect brought about by those means, immortal glory.

John of St. Thomas (1589-1644), the outstanding Baroque Thomist, delineates the structure of the *Summa* in the following scheme:

Pars Prima. *Deus secundum se, et ut causa efficiens creaturarum* (119 questions)

Proemium: scientia theologiae (q. 1)

1. Deus secundum se: quoad entitatem et attributa absoluta; et quoad relativa, seu mysterium Trinitatis (qq. 2-43)

2. Deus ut causa efficiens: processio creaturarum et gubernatio eorum a Deo (qq. 44-119)

Pars Prima Secundae. *Deus ut finis assequibilis a creatura rationali per actus suos* (114 questions)

1. Ipse finis hominis (qq. 1-5)
2. Actus morales seu voluntarii, in communi (qq. 6-114)

Pars Secunda Secundae. *Actus humani tendentibus vel deviantes a fine, in speciali* (119 questions)

1. Virtutes et vitia communiores status (qq. 1-170)
2. Virtutes et vitia specialis status (qq. 171-189)

Pars Tertia. *Deus ut reparator humanorum defectuum, hoc est, Verbum Incarnatum* (incomplete; 90 questions)

1. Mysterium Incarnationis (qq. 1-59)
2. Media quibus ei unimur, et quibus reparationem hanc nobis applicat, scilicet sacramenta (qq. 60-90; incomplete)
3. Effectus finis ad quem pervenimus per hanc reparationem, scilicet gloria immortalis (not worked out)

This masterwork of Aquinas, it was commonly believed, was the very consummation of theology, the climax of its architectonic organization, and the fulfillment of the yearning for a perfect system by the Fathers and Doctors of earlier times. For John, such perfection could not have been realized without supernatural aid. However, this postulated perfection does not lie in the originality of the overall pattern, which is basically that of Lombard, as can be seen from the following table:

God in Himself and as creator. LOMBARD, Book 1 (48 distinctions)

AQUINAS, Prima Pars (119 questions). God in Himself and as efficient cause (creator and conserver)

The creature, especially man. LOMBARD, Book 2 (44 distinctions)

AQUINAS, Prima Secundae (114 questions), man's actions in general

AQUINAS, Secunda Secundae (189 questions), man's actions in particular

Christ. LOMBARD, Book 3 (40 distinctions)

AQUINAS, Tertia Pars (59 questions). The Incarnation

The sacraments. LOMBARD (50 distinctions)

AQUINAS, Tertia Pars (31 questions, incomplete). The sacraments

In Lombard, each topic has a separate book devoted to it, except Book 1, where two distinct topics, God in Himself and as Creator, are discussed in a single work, a practice repeated by Aquinas. In Lombard, the number of units ("distinctions") assigned to the topics is fairly equal, ranging from 40 to 50. In Aquinas, on the other hand, an inordinate number of questions is allotted to the *Secunda Pars* (303, as contrasted with the 119 of the *Prima Pars*; anthropology, the study of man, overwhelms theology, the discourse on God), so that it had to be broken up into two portions, the *Prima Secundae* and the *Secunda Secundae*. In addition, the distinct themes that Lombard allocates to different books, 3 and 4, are combined by Aquinas in one (*Tertia Pars*). This lack of congruence between theme and literary form discouraged Baroque theologians from attempting to cover the entire spectrum of theology in a single (and unwieldy) work, and encouraged them to work out their syntheses in a sequence of concatenated monographs or tracts.

Be that as it may, the main lines of the works of Lombard and Aquinas correspond; the difference lies in the working out of the details: the elaboration of the subtopics and their coordination with the main categories and with one another. In this Aquinas clearly excels. In the *Summa Theologiae* question succeeds question, and one topic follows another in a limpid and continuous flow.

After Aquinas, theologians did not at once imitate his example and create theological syntheses of their own, following the organic method. They were overawed by the comprehensiveness and profundity of the Angelic Doctor's thought. They felt that the full depth of meaning of that thought had to be brought out, and that could best be done in commentaries, where too, the Doctor's positions could be defended against attack. During the Renaissance two commentarial classics were produced on the two *Summas* of Aquinas, on the *Summa Contra Gentiles* by Sylvester of Ferrara (c. 1474-1528), and on the *Summa Theologiae* by Cajetan (1469-1534). Yet, though using the commentarial method, Cajetan was no mere commentator, concerned less with providing an authentic exegesis of Aquinas's thought than with using that thought as a basis for his own speculation—thus creating his own brand of philosophy. For centuries this philosophy was taken to be the very essence of Thomism, but is reviled by some modern Thomists as a betrayal of the Master's thought. But Cajetan is

a modern thinker, who deserves to be judged for the distinctiveness of his own ideas, rather than for his fidelity to the thought of another.

Cajetan and Sylvester were both Dominicans, but in the Baroque age the members of the new Jesuit order produced their own commentaries, the most noteworthy and original of which is that of Gabriel Vázquez (1549-1604). Other orders also contributed their commentaries, like the Mercedarian Francisco Zumel(1540-1607), who was known as "the Prince of the Thomists of these times."

So much was the pattern of the *Summa Theologiae* appreciated by theologians of all orders, that it was superimposed on the works of non-Thomists too, especially by the followers of Bonaventure and Scotus. They took the texts of their founders apart, so to speak, and rearranged them according to the Common Doctor's treatise.

Each Scholastic labored to create the definitive system of theology, but was faced with the inescapable fact of the existence of many systems. So efforts were made to harmonize these different systems, particularly by the followers of Bonaventure, Scotus, Bernard, Aegidius (and in the Baroque age, Suárez). Only the Thomists displayed no interest in such harmonization; as far as they were concerned, theirs was the definitive system.

Commentarial amplification of the Thomist synthesis: Dominican

CAJETAN (1469-1534), Commentary on entire *Summa Theologiae* (1502-1522), 10 vol.

FRANCISCUS SYLVESTER FERRARIENSIS (c.1474-1528), Commentary on the *Summa Contra Gentiles* (dedicated 1524, published 1552, posth.)

DOMINGO BAÑEZ (1528-1604), Commentary on the I & II Pars only (1584-1594), 4 vol.

FRANCISCO DE ARAÚJO (1580-1664), Commentary on entire *Summa Theologiae* (1635-1647)

Commentarial amplification of the Thomist synthesis: Jesuit commentaries on the Summa

FRANCISCO DE TOLEDO (1532-1596), written 1559-1563, published only in 1869

GREGORIO DE VALENCIA (1545-1603), published in 1591-1597, 4 vol.

GABRIEL VÁZQUEZ (1549-1604), Commentary on the I, I-II & III Pars (1598-1615), 8 vol.

Commentarial amplification of the Thomist synthesis: other commentators

FRANCISCO ZUMEL, Mercedarian (1540-1607), *De Deo Eiusque Operibus: Commentaria in IP S. Thomae Aquinatis* (1585), 2 vol.; *In I-IIae S.Thomae Commentaria* (1584), 2 vol.

FRANCISCUS SYLVIUS, Canon (1581-1649), Commentary on the entire *Summa Theologiae* (1620-1635), 4 vol.

Application of the Summa Theologiae Format to Bonaventurian works

PETRUS TRIGOSUS, first Jesuit, then Capuchin (1533-1593), *Sancti Bonaventurae Summa Theologica* (1593)

FRANCESCO CORIOLANO, *Summa Theologica ad Instar Summae Sancti Thomae ex Operibus Sancti Bonaventurae* (1622), 7 vol.

Application of the Summa Theologiae format to Scotist works

ANGELUS VULPES (c.1590-1647), *Summa Sacrae Theologiae Joannis Duns Scoti et Commentaria in Eiusdem* (1622), 10 vol.

HIERONYMUS DE MONTEFORTINO (1662-1738), *Joannis Duns Scoti Summa Theologica ex Operibus Eius Concinnata Juxta Ordinem et Dispositionem Summae Theologicae Divi Thomae* (1728-1732), 5 vol.

Harmonization of Doctors: towards a unified theological system

Bonaventure and Scotus. FELIX GABRIEL DE ASCUTO (+1684), *Theologicae Disputationes...ad Mentem Divi Bonaventurae et Scoti* (1653)

Bonaventure, Scotus, Hales & Augustine. MATTHIAS HAUZEUR (1589-1676), *Collatio Totius Theologiae inter Maiores Nostros.... Alexandrum Halensem...Bonaventuram... Scotum... ad Mentem Augustini* (1646)

Bonaventure and Aquinas BONAVENTURA LINGONENSIS (fl. 1613-1673), *Bonaventurae Bonaventura, seu Unica Geminaque Theologiae Summa ex Omnibus fere Sanctorum Thomae et Bonaventurae Placitis.... Concinnata* (1653)

Bonaventure, Aquinas & Scotus. MARCUS DE BAUDUNIO (1606-1692), *Paradisus Philosophicus Unius ac Trium Doctorum, Angelici, Seraphici et Subtilis Horumque Conciliatoris* (1654); *Paradisus Theologicus Unius ac Trium Doctorum, Angelici, Seraphici et Subtilis Horumque Conciliatoris* (1661).

Scotus & Aquinas. FRANCISCO MACEDO (1596-1681), *Collationes Doctrinae Sancti Thomae et Scoti* (1671), 2 vol.

Aquinas & Bernard. BERNARDUS DE SAYVE, *Sapientum... Doctorum Bernardi Melliflui ac Thomae Angelici Doctrinae Conformitas* (1675)

Scotus,Aquinas & Aegidius. RAFFAELLE BONERBA (c. 1600-1681, *Inter Sanctum Thomam et Scotum Metaphysicalis Aegidiana Concordia* (1642); *Aegidianum Propugnaculum Philosophicum Divi Thomae et Scoti* (1661)

Aquinas & Suárez. JOAQUÍN NAVARRO, Jesuit (1705-1780), *Cursus Theologiae ad Mentem Doctorum Angelici et Eximii* (1765-1767), 3 vol.

3. Philosophical synthesis: commentarial method

Medieval theologians aimed at creating theological systems with the ancillary aid of philosophy. They did not study the latter for its own sake, except in commentaries on the philosophical works of the Philosopher. However, a philosophical compilation combining the commentarial and organic methods, was worked out by the Renaissance Dominican Thomist GIOVANNI CRISOSTOMO JAVELLI (1488-1550), in his *Totius Philosophiae, Rationalis, Naturalis, Divinae et Moralis, Compendium*, posthumously published in two volumes in 1580. It was a sort of resumé of the works of a few authors, Christian and pagan (Aristotle and Plato), evaluated by Thomist principles. But the commentarial method died hard, and many years had to elapse before it became obsolete. A concerted effort to create a philosophical synthesis, still in the form of a commentary on Aristotle, was made by the Portuguese Jesuits of Coimbra in the late 16th century. The synthetic character of their work lay in the arrangement of Aristotle's relevant treatises in the right thematic order and in the systematic treatment of the questions raised by the text. The Aristotelian corpus covered the entire field of philosophy, but the treatises that composed it had not been seen as interconnected units, and were commented on individually and discretely. The aim of the promoters of the Coimbra project was the creation of a single "Cursus Philosophicus." The project was thus a collective one, the first of its kind, not only in Baroque Scholasticism, but perhaps in the history of philosophy. (The *Conimbricenses* were to provide the model for later Baroque collective projects, like the *Salmanticenses*.) The Cursus was designed by Manuel de Gois (1543-1597), and elaborated by him and by Baltasar Álvares (1561-1630), Cosme de Magalhães (1563-1624) and

Sebastião do Couto (1567-1639). The Aristotelian treatises commented on by de Gois were those on physics, biology, psychology and ethics; by Álvares and Magalhães on psychology, and by Couto on dialectics.

More original than any of the *Conimbricenses* was their elder contemporary, also a Jesuit, Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599). The very originality of his thought made the Coimbra Jesuits wary of letting him participate in the writing of their *Cursus*, though that appears to have been the original plan. Fonseca authored three works: *Institutiones Dialecticae* (1564), *Isagoge Philosophica* (1591), and *Commentarii in Libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis* (1577-1612, 4 vol.). Fonseca was of the opinion that no one could be trained as a philosopher except on the basis of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. Accordingly, its authentic Greek text had first to be established, which Fonseca did, providing a Latin translation to go with it, as well as a commentary. With this, Fonseca's role as a commentator ended. He then adopted the organic method, laying out a series of "quaestiones" suggested by the Aristotelian text, and discussing them in a manner focused more on their intelligibility and inner logic than with their consonance with the text commented on earlier.

4. Philosophical synthesis: organic method

Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), the *Doctor Eximius*, began his career as a commentator on the *Tertia Pars* of the *Summa* of Aquinas. In his analysis of its theological ideas, he found that he had constantly to turn to philosophical concepts to clarify those ideas, and that these concepts had a logic, intelligibility and structure of their own, irrespective of their ancillary connection with theology. This motivated him to produce a metaphysical treatise which was not to be a commentary on Aristotle, but an independent work formed on the organic method. This work, the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, was published in two volumes in 1597. With it medieval philosophy ends and the modern begins. In it we have a perfect consonance of literary form and logical structure. The entire treatise consists of 54 "disputations," 27 in each volume, and arranged in five sections, the second volume having an added supplement. The following is a schematic outline of the work's contents, the numbers in parentheses are those of the disputations:

Volume 1. ENS UT SIC (1-27)
1. **Natura metaphysicae** (1)
2. **Ratio essentialis entis** (2)
3. **Entis passiones** (3-11)
   Unitas vs. distinctio (4-7)
   Veritas vs. falsitas (8-9)
   Bonum vs. malum (10-11)
4. **Causae entis** (12-25)
   Materialis (13-14)
   Formalis (15-16)
   Efficiens, including the Prima Causa, in its three operations, creation, conservation, cooperation (17-22)
   Finalis (23-24)
   Exemplaris (25)
5. **Comparatio causarum** (26-27)
   Ad effectus (26)
   Inter se (27)

Volume 2. DIVISIONES ENTIS (28-54)
1. **Ens finitum et infinitum** (28)
2. **Ens infinitum** (29-30)
   An sit (29)
   Quid sit (30)
3. **Ens finitum, ut sic** (31)
4. **Entis finiti divisiones: substantia et accidens** (32-38)
   Substantia (33-36)
   Accidens (37-38)
5. **Accidens: novem praedicamenta** (39-53)
   Quantitas (40-41)
   Qualitas (42-46)
   Relatio (47)
   Actio (48)
   Passio (49)
   Quando (50)
   Ubi (51)
   Situs (52)
   Habitus (53)

Supplement: **Ens rationis** (54)

Subsequent to the *Disputationes*, which marks the irreversible doom of the commentarial method and the definitive triumph of the organic, Scholastic thinkers, evidently inspired by the Doctor's example, began

to compose treatises, the plans of which were of each author's own devising. Authors affiliated to the major systems (Bonaventurian, Scotist, Thomist and Jesuit) organized syntheses that were philosophical and theological. Foremost among the authors of these systems are the following. Of the Jesuits, in philosophy, the Suarezian Hurtado de Mendoza (!578-1651), and in theology the Suarezian Becanus (1559-1624) and also the *Wirceburgenses* (1766-1771, the collective work of the Jesuits of Würzburg). Of the Thomists, in philosophy, the Dominican Goudin (1639-1695), and in theology the Dominicans Gonet (1616-1681) and Billuart (1685-1759). Of the Scotists, in philosophy, Cavellus (C.1575-1626), and in theology Henno (1662-1714). Of the Bonaventurians, in theology, Gaudentius Bontempus (1612-1672).

The organic method also served to reduce to system the thought of medieval thinkers who had not created complete systems of their own: thinkers such as the *Doctor Magnificus*, the Benedictine Anselm (1033-1109); the *Doctor Mellifluus*, the Cistercian Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153); the *Doctor Solemnis*, Henry of Ghent (c. 1217-1293), official theologian of the Servite order; and the *Doctor Fundatissimus*, Aegidius Romanus (c. 1243-1316), official theologian of the Augustinian order. Of these minor systems, those of the Anselmians, Bernardians and Aegidians appear to have been only theological. Prominent among the Anselmians was Saenz de Aguirre (1630-1699), among the Bernardians Burghoff (1614-1665), and among the Aegidians Federico Gavardi (1634-1715) and Gianlorenzo Berti (1696-1766).

In the 18th century, alongside the Baroque Scholastic, there flourished systems of the nascent modern philosophy, rationalist and empiricist. A number of these "modernists" followed the Scholastic method, but their philosophical tenets were influenced by those of rationalism and empiricism. For want of a better word, we may identify these thinkers as the Scholastic Eclectic. Eclectic Scholasticism does not appear to have created philosophical syntheses, only theological ones, salient among which are those of Tournely (1658-1729) and Antoine (1678-1743). These authors, like Baroque theologians in general, wrote voluminous tracts, which—as the Portuguese pulpit orator António Vieira (1608-1697) put it—seem more like book-collections (or libraries) than books (*que mais parecem escreveram livrarias, que livros*).

Philosophical syntheses: Jesuit

PEDRO HURTADO DE MENDOZA (1578-1651, Suarezian), *Disputationes a Summulis ad Metaphysicam/ Disputationes de Universa Philosophia* (1615)

ALFONSO PEÑAFIEL (1594-1657), *Cursus Integer Philosophicus* (1653-1670), 4 vol.

ANTONIO BERNALDO DE QUIRÓS (1613-1668),*Opus Philosophicum* (1658)

JOANNES BAPTISTA DE BENEDICTIS (1641-1706), *Philosophia Peripatetica* (1687-1692), 4 vol.

LUIS DE LOSSADA (1681-1748, Suarezian), *Cursus Philosophicus Collegii Salmanticensis* (1724-1735), 3 vol.

Philosophical syntheses: Thomist (Dominican, Benedictine, Carmelite)

ANTOINE GOUDIN, Dominican (1639-1695), *Philosophia* (1671). 4 vol.

LUDOVICUS BABENSTUBER, Benedictine (1660-1726), *Philosophia Thomistica Salisburgensis* (1705)

EMMERICUS A SANCTO STEPHANO, Discalced Carmelite (1691-1756), *Philosophia Thomistica*.... (1729), 2 vol.

Philosophical syntheses: Scotist (Franciscan)

HUGO CAVELLUS (c. 1575-1626), *Doctoris Subtilis Quaestiones Subtilissimae et Expositio in Metaphysicam Aristotelis* (1625)

BONAVENTURA COLUMBUS, *Epitome Dialecticae et Novi Cursus Philosophici Scotistarum* (1638)

RUBEUS DE LUGO, *Philosophiae Cursus Secundum Scotum* (1653); *Controversiae Metaphysicales Inter Scotistas* (1653)

BONAVENTURA BARO (1610-1696), *Doctor Subtilis per Universam Philosophiam Defensus* (1664)

ILLUMINATO DE ODDO, *Cursus Integer Philosophicus ad Mentem Scoti* (1664), 4 vol.

GIOVANNI AMBROSINO, *Enchiridion Philosophicum Universalem Aristotelis Philosophiam Complectens Juxta Mentem Scoti* (1689), 3 vol.

CLAUDE JOSEPH DE S. FLORIAN (fl. 1777-1782), *Joannis Duns Scoti Philosophia Recentioribus Placitis Accomodata* (1782), 7 vol.

Philosophical syntheses: Bonaventurian (Franciscan)

MARCUS ANTONIUS DE CARPENEDULO (+1665), *Summa Totius Philosophiae ad Mentem Sancti Bonaventurae* (1634)

HYACINTHUS OLPENSIS, *Cursus Philosophicus ad Mentem Seraphici Doctoris* (1691)

Philosophical syntheses: Aegidian (Augustinian)

NICCOLÒ DI S. GIOVANNI BATTISTA, *Philosophia Augustiniana, sive Integer Cursus Philosophicus Juxta Doctrinam P. Augustini* (1687), 6 vol.

Theological syntheses: Jesuit

MARTINUS BECANUS (1559-1624, Suarezian), *Summa Theologiae Scholasticae* (1612), 4 vol.

ADAMUS TANNER (1578-1632, Suarezian), *Theologia Scholastica* (1627), 4 vol.

FRANCISCUS AMICO (1578-1651), *Cursus Theologicus* (1630-1651), 9 vol.

JACOBUS PLATELIUS (1608-1681), *Synopsis Cursus Theologici* (1661)

JUAN ULLOA (1639-c.1723), *Theologia Scholastica* (1719), 5 vol.

JUAN MARÍN (1654-1725), *Theologia Speculativa* (1720), 3 vol.

FRANÇOIS NOEL (1651-1759, Suarezian), *Theologiae R. P. Suárez... Summa seu Compendium* (1732)

WIRCEBURGENSES, *Theologia Wirceburgensis/Herbipolensis* (1766-1771), 5 vol.

HENRICUS KILBER (1710-1783), THOMAS HOLTZCLAU (1716-1783), IGNAZ NEUBAUER (1726-1795)

Theological syntheses: Thomist (Dominican, Carmelite, Benedictine)

PEDRO GODOY, Dominican (1606-1677), *Disputationes Theologicae in Summam Theologiae* (1666-1672; except on II-II), 7 vol.

PIERRE LABAT, Dominican (1600-1670), *Theologia Scholastica Secundum Illibatam S. Thomae Doctrinam, sive Cursus Theologicus...* (1658-1661), 8 vol.

PHILIPPUS A S. TRINITATE, Discalced Carmelite (1603-1671), *Summa Theologiae Thomisticae* (1653), 5 vol.

JEAN-BAPTISTE GONET, Dominican (1616-1681), *Clypeus Theologiae Thomisticae Contra Novos Eius Impugnatores* (1659-1669), 16 vol.

ALEXANDRE PINY, Dominican (1639-1709), *Summae Angelicae Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Compendium Resolutorium* (1680), 4 vol.

NOEL ALEXANDRE, Dominican (1639-1724), *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, seu Speculationes Universae Doctrinae Sacrae* (1673-1676), 2 vol.

VINCENT CONTENSON, Dominican (1641-1674), *Theologia Mentis et Cordis* (1668)

PAUL MEZGER, Benedictine (1637-1702), *Theologia Scholastica Salisburgensis* (date ?), 4 vol.

VINCENZO GOTTI, Dominican (1664-1742), *Theologia Scholastico-Dogmatica Juxta Incutem Divi Thomae Aquinatis* ... (1727-1735), 16 vol.

CHARLES-RENÉ BILLUART, Dominican (1685-1757), *Summa Sancti Thomae Hodiernis Academiarum Moribus Accomodata* (1746-1751), 19 vol.

DANIELE CONCINA, Dominican (1687-1756), *Theologia Christiana Dogmatico-Moralis* (1749-1751), 12 vol.

Theological syntheses: Scotist (Franciscan)

GUILLAUME HERINCX (1621-1678), *Summa Theologiae Scholasticae et Moralis Juxta Mentem Doctoris Subtilis* (1660-1663), 3 vol.

BERNARDUS SANNIG (1637-1681/3), *Schola Theologica Scotistarum, seu Cursus Theologicus Completus* (1679), 2 vol.

JOANNES BOSCO, *Theologia Spiritualis Scholastica et Moralis ad Mentem Scoti* (1686)

FRANCISCUS HENNO (1662-1714), *Theologia Dogmatica, Moralis et Scholastica* (1706-1713), 8 vol.

BARTHOLOMAEUS DURANDUS (fl. 1685-1720+), *Clypeus Scoticae Theologiae Contra Novos Eius Impugnatores* (1709), 5 vol.

MARINUS PANGER, *Theologia Scholastica Moralis Polemica Juxta Mentem Scoti* (1732), 4 vol.

Theological syntheses: Bonaventurian (Franciscan)

MARCELLUS RHEGIENSIS (1609-1682), *Summa Seraphica, in qua Sancti Bonaventurae Seraphica Theologia... Dilucide est Enodata* (1669)

GAUDENTIUS BONTEMPUS (1612-1672), *Palladium Theologicum seu Tota Theologia Scholastica... ad Intimam Mentem Divi Bonaventurae* (1676), 7 vol.

FRANÇOIS-MARIE DE BRUXELLES (+1713), *Theologia Capuccinoserafica, Scholastica et Moralis* (1714)

Theological syntheses: Aegidian (Augustinian)

FEDERICO NICOLA GAVARDI (1634-1715), *Schola Aegidiana, sive Theologia Exantiquata Juxta Doctrinam Sancti Augustini* (1678-1696), 6 vol. ; *Theologia Scholastica Aegidio-Augustiniana* (1706)

GIANLORENZO BERTI (1696-1766), *De Theologicis Disciplinis* (1739-1745), 8 vol.

JUAN FACUNDO VILLAROIG (1748-1816), *Institutiones Christianae Theologiae* (1782-1788), 4 vol.

Theological syntheses: Anselmian (Benedictine)

JOSÉ SAENZ DE AGUIRRE (1630-1699), *Sancti Anselmi... Theologia* (1679-1685), 3 vol.

NICCOLÒ MARIA TEDESCHI (1671-1730), *Scholae Divi Anselmi Doctrina* (1705); *Doctrinae Synopsis* (1708)

Theological syntheses: Bernardian (Cistercian)

ALBERICUS BURGHOFF (1614-1665), *Assertiones Theologicae Methodo Doctoris Angelici, Verbis et Sensu Doctoris Melliflui Theodidacti Bernardi Excriptae...* (1649); *Bernardus Theologus. Sive Summa Theologiae... Doctoris Bernardi... Scholasticorum Doctrina et Consensu Illustrata* (1673)

LAURENTIUS BERNARDUS A S. PETRO APUSIUS (fl. 1629-1681). *Divi Bernardi...Doctoris Melliflui Theologia Speculativa* (1675-1678). 4 vol.

Theological syntheses: Scholastic Eclectic

EDMOND SIMONET, Jesuit (1662-1732), *Institutiones Theologicae* (1721-1728), 11 vols.

PAUL-GABRIEL ANTOINE, Jesuit (1678-1743), *Theologia Universa Speculativa et Dogmatica* (1723)

HONORÉ DE TOURNELY (1658-1729), *Praelectiones Theologicae* (1725-1730), 16 vol. ; *Cursus Theologicus Scholastico-Dogmaticus* (1731-1746), 10 vol.

MARTIN GERBERT, Benedictine (1723-1793), *Principia Theologiae* (1757-1759), 8 vol.

BAILLY, LOUIS (1730-1808), *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis* (1789), 8 vol.

STEPHANUS WIEST, Cistercian (1748-1797), *Institutiones-Theologiae Dogmaticae in Usum Academicum* (1791)

III. SYSTEMATIC INTEGRATION OF THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY

1. The Suarezian super-system

We arrive at the climax of Baroque Scholasticism—indeed of Scholasticism as a whole—the integration of two systems, a philosophy and a theology, into a single system, or super-system, with the former the basis of the latter. This again was the creation of Suárez, who was the first, and apparently the only, Scholastic thinker to systematize both his own philosophy and his theology. If the medieval systems remind us of the Gothic cathedrals, the Suarezian reminds us of the cathedrals of the Renaissance and Baroque, like St. Peter's in Rome.

In 1590, the Uncommon Doctor began work on his theological synthesis, but interrupted it to complete his philosophical system, evolved in his *Disputationes Metaphysicae* (1597). He then resumed work on his theological synthesis, now secure in its philosophical foundations, and nearly complete at the time of his death in 1617. Each theme was treated comprehensively and in a thorough manner; part of the treatment was the summation of the theological and philosophical speculation on that theme in prior Christian and pre-Christian, and in contemporary times. The encyclopedic detail of the analysis made it impossible to incorporate the super-system in one single work; its only mode of presentation would have to be in a succession of monographs or treatises. The following is a schematic outline of the systematics of Suárez:

Ens ut sic	
ut creatum et increatum	*Disputationes metaphysicae* (1597)
Deus in se	
ut unus	*De divina substantia eiusque attributis* (1606)
	De divina praedestinatione et reprobatione (1606)
ut trinus	*De sanctissimo Trinitatis mysterio* (1606)
Deus ut causa efficiens	
creaturae incorporeae	*De angelis* (1620)
creaturae corporeae	*De opere sex dierum* 1621)
creaturae compositae, sive hominis	*De anima* (1621)
Deus ut causa finalis	
ipse finis	*De ultimo fine hominis* (1628)
ut legislator dirigens ad finem	*De legibus* (1612)
ut sanctificator	*De gratia* (1619)
	De fide, spe et charitate (1622)
ut dignus adorationis	*De religione* (1608-1625)
ut redemptor	*De Incarnatione* (1590-1592)
	De sacramentis (1593-1603)

These are the main treatises that constitute the Suarezian synthesis, possibly the most titanic enterprise in systematics ever undertaken by any single individual in the history of thought.

2. The formation of other super-systems on the Suarezian model

After Suárez, the creator of the prototypical super-system, other individual authors, again doubtless inspired by his example, composed other such systems, each author writing complementary tracts on philosophy and theology. But these tractators (except possibly the Jesuits, foremost among whom was Roderigo de Arriaga, 1592-1667) were not professing to create original systems, but only to methodically present the thought of established theologians who had not formally codified their own philosophies, particularly the Big Three of medieval times—Bonaventure, Aquinas and Scotus—founders of the major schools of theology. But there was also a minor school that evolved a super-system, that of the *Doctor Resolutus* John Baconthorp (c. 1290-1346?), the official theologian of the Calced Carmelite order. Of all the epigonic super-systematicians the most eminent were the Thomists, especially the Portuguese theologian and philosopher, the *Doctor Profundus* João de S. Tomás/John of St. Thomas (1589-1644), who constructed a super-system in the brief space of seven years. In addition to systems organized by individual authors, there were those created by the collective effort of many theologians, thus bringing to fruition the mode of collective creation pioneered by the *Conimbricenses*. A monumental corpus of Thomist systematics was put together by three Discalced Carmelite collectives: the *Complutenses*, or Carmelites of Complutum (or Alcalá de Henares, 1624-1628), authors of a course of philosophy; the first *Salmanticenses*, authors of a course on dogmatic theology (1631-1704); and the second *Salmanticenses*, authors of a course on moral theology (1665-1707). Antonio de la Madre de Dios (1583-1641) participated in both the philosophical *Complutenses* and the dogmatic *Salmanticenses*. Ildefonso de los Angeles (1664-1737) contributed to both the *Salmanticenses* courses, dogmatic and moral. Outstanding from among the Discalced Carmelite Thomists was Juan de la Anunciación (1633-1701), equal in profundity with *the Doctor Profundus* himself. The publication of the *Complutenses* took four years; the dogmatic *Salmanticenses* 81 years; and the moral *Salmanticenses* 42 years. Thus the Thomist collective enterprise of the Discalced Carmelites—philosophical, theological and moral, published in 22 volumes—took in all 127 years. (The three Carmelite enterprises, the *Complutenses* and the two

Salmanticenses, were intended to be completed by a fourth project, the *Biacenses*, a Scholastic synthesis of the Scriptures, by the Carmelite college of Baeza, but only one volume was published, in 1728, the *Cursus Theologico-Expositivus*.)

The last *Salmanticenses* volume came out in 1724. Only 27 years afterwards two French *philosophes* (who were born in the lifetime of the last Carmelites of Salamanca), Denis Diderot (1713-1784) and Jean d'Alembert (1717-1783), edited the *Encyclopédie* (1751-1772) in 28 volumes, a work of comparable magnitude with the *Salmanticenses* but of a radically different philosophy (besides lacking coherence and unity) whose publication rang the death knell of the Baroque age.

Scotists and Bonaventurians engaged in no collective enterprises, but yet erected imposing super-systems. Standing out from among the Scotists are Claude Frassen (1620-1711) and Crescentius Krisper (1699-1768); and from among the Bonaventurians Marcus de Baudunio (1606-1692), who sought to harmonize the thought of the Big Three of medieval theology, the Doctors Seraphic, Angelic and Subtle.

Alongside the theologians referred to above (and more influential than many of them) were theologians who composed no complete courses of theology, but only discoursed upon individual themes in monographs, while always, in true Baroque manner, being aware of the relationship of the theme that concerned them to the entire conspectus of Catholic doctrine. These "monographers" were among the most creative thinkers of the Baroque age. They include the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (c. 1485-1546), the inaugurator of Baroque Scholasticism, with its balance of speculation and positive research, who first advanced the notion of international law; the Dominican Melchior Cano (1509-1560), who codified the Baroque Scholastic methodology; the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), the renowned and controverted master of theological polemics; and the Jesuit Luis de Molina (1536-1600), formulator of the theory of the *scientia media*, to resolve the antinomy between divine predestination and human freedom (though he may got the idea from the Jesuit Pedro da Fonseca,,1528-1599, promoter of many original ideas). Authors of monographs that became classics, unsurpassed for their thoroughness and profundity, are: Tomás Sanchez (1550-1610) on matrimony; Ruiz de Montoya (1583-1660) on the Trinity; Juan

de Lugo (1583-1660) on justice, and Juan Martinez de Ripalda (1594-1648) on supernatural being.

Jesuit super-systems

THOMAS COMPTON-CARLETON (c.1591-1666), *Philosophia Universa* (1649); *Cursus Theologicus* (1658-1664), 2 vol.

RODERIGO DE ARRIAGA (1592-1667), *Cursus Philosophicus* (1632); *Cursus Theologicus Completus* (*Disputationes Theologicae*, 1643-1655), 8 vol.

GEORGIUS DE RHODES (1597-1661), *Philosophia Peripatetica ad Veram Aristotelis Mentem* (1671); *Disputationes Theologiae Scholasticae* (1661), 2 vol.

SYLVESTER MAURUS (1619-1687), *Quaestiones Philosophicae* (1658), 5 vol.; *Quaestiones Theologicae* (1676-1679), 6 vol.

ANTONINUS MAYR (1673-1749), *Philosophia Peripatetica* (1739), 4 vol.; *Cursus Theologiae Scholasticae* (1729-1732), 8 vol.

Thomist super-systems (Dominican, Carmelite, Benedictine, Theatine and Cistercian)

RAFFAELLE AVERSA, Theatine (c. 1589-1657), *Philosophia* (1625-1627), 2 vol. ; *Theologia Scholastica Universa ad Mentem Sancti Thomae* (1631-1642), 9 vol.

JOHN OF ST. THOMAS, Dominican (1589-1644), *Cursus Philosophicus Thomisticus* (1637-1638); *Cursus Theologicus Thomisticus* (1637-1644...1667)

EUSTACHIUS A SANCTO PAULO, Cistercian (fl. 1605-1640+), *Summa Philosophica Quadripartita de Rebus Dialecticis, Moralibus, Physicis, et Metaphysicis* (1609); *Summa Theologica Tripartita* (1613-1616)

PHILIPPE DE LA TRINITÉ, Discalced Carmelite (1603-1671), *Summa Philosophica* (1648); *Cursus Theologicus Iuxta Partes Summae Divi Thomae* (1633-1663), 5 vol.; *Summa Theologiae Mysticae* (1656), 3 vol.

COELESTINUS SFONDRATI, Benedictine (1644-1696), *Cursus Philosophicus Sangallensis* (1695- 1699), 3 vol.; *Cursus Theologicus* (1670), 10 vol.

COMPLUTENSES, Discalced Carmelite, *Artium Cursus... per Collegium Complutense* (1624-1628), 4 years, 4 vol.

ANTONIO DE LA MADRE DE DIOS (1583-1641), tome 1

JUAN DE LOS SANTOS (1583-1654), tome 2

MIGUEL DE LA SANTÍSIMA TRINIDAD (1588-1661), tome 3

BLAISE DE LA CONCEPTION (1603-1694), tome 4

SALMANTICENSES, Discalced Carmelite (Dogmatic Theology), *Collegii Salmanticensis ...Cursus Theologicus* (1631-1704), 12 vol.

ANTONIO DE LA MADRE DE DIOS (1583-1641), tomes 1-2
DOMINGO DE SANTA TERESA (1604-1660), tomes 3-4
JUAN DE LA ANUNCIACIÓN (1633-1701), tomes 5-11, partly 12
ANTONIO DE S. JUAN BAUTISTA (1641-1699), tome 12, in part
ILDEFONSO DE LOS ANGELES (1664-1737), tome 12, in part

SALMANTICENSES, Discalced Carmelite (Moral Theology), *Cursus Theologiae Moralis* (1665- 1707), 7 vol.

ILDEFONSO DE LOS ANGELES (1664-1737), tome 6
FRANCISCO DE JESÚS MARIA (1599-1677), tome 1
ANDRÉS DE LA MADRE DE DIOS (1622-1674), tomes 2-4
SEBASTIÁN DE S. JOAQUÍN (1672-1719), tomes 5 & 6
ANTONIO DEL SANTÍSIMO SACRAMENTO (1706-1761), tome 7

TOMMASO D'AQUINO DELLA NATIVITÀ, Discalced Carmelite (1710-1783), *Institutiones Philosophicae* (1760), 5 vol.; *Institutiones Theologicae* (1761), 6 vol.

Scotist super-systems (Franciscan)

JOANNES PONCIUS (1603-1672/3), *Philosophiae ad Mentem Scoti Cursus Integer* (1643), 3 vol.; *Theologiae Cursus Integer ad Mentem Scoti, seu Universa Doctoris Subtilis Theologica Dogmata* (1652)

BONAVENTURA BELLUTUS (1600-1676, philosophy only) & BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS DE MELDULA (1602-1673), *Cursus Integer Philosophiae ad Mentem Scoti* (1678-1688), 3 vol.; *Disputationes Theologicae in IV Libros Sententiarum* (1655-1661), 4 vol.

JEAN GABRIEL BOYVIN (+c.1680), *Philosophia Scoti a Prolixitate, et Subtilitas Eius ab Obscuritate Liberata et Vindicata* (1684); *Theologia Joannis Duns Scoti* (1678), 4 vol.

AMAND HERMANN (fl. 1676-1700+), *Sol Triplex in Universo, id est, Universae Philosophiae Cursus Augustini, Bernardi et Scoti Mente Conformatus* (1676); *Tractatus Theologici ad Mentem Subtilis Doctoris* (1690-1694)

CLAUDE FRASSEN (1620-1711), *Philosophia Academica ex Selectissimis....Aristotelis et.... Scoti Rationibus et Sententiis* (1668); *Scotus Academicus* (1672), 4 vol.

SEBASTIEN DUPASQUIER (1630-1718?), *Summa Philosophiae Scholasticae et Scotisticae* (1705), 4 vol.; *Summa Theologiae Scholasticae* (1719), 4 vol.

CRESCENTIUS KRISPER (1699-1768), *Philosophia Scholae Scotisticae* (1735); *Theologia Scholae Scotisticae* (1728), 4 vol.

BERNARDO DE BOLOGNA (1680-1749), *Institutio Philosophica Praemittenda Theologiae, nunc Aristotelis et Joannis Duns Scoti Acumine*

Structa (1766), 3 vol.; *Institutiones Theologiae Juxta Omnia Fidei Dogmata Doctoris Subtilis* (1746)

GIUSEPPE ANTONIO FERRARI (fl. 1746-1760), *Philosophia Peripatetica Propugnata Rationibus J. D. Scoti* (1746), 3 vol.; *Veterae et Recentioris Philosophiae Dogmata J. D. Scoti Doctrinis Accomodata* (1754), 3 vol.; *Theologia Scholastica Critico-Historico-Dogmatica ad Mentem J. D. Scoti* (1760)

Bonaventurian super-systems (Franciscan)

MARCUS DE BAUDUNIO (1606-1692), *Paradisus Philosophicus Unius ac Trium Doctorum, Angelici, Seraphici, et Subtilis Horumque Conciliatoris* (1654); *Paradisus Theologicus Unius ac Trium Doctorum, Angelici, Seraphici, et Subtilis Horumque Conciliatoris* (1661); *Compendium Theologiae tam Speculativae quam Practicae* (1673)

BARTHOLOMAEUS DE BARBERIIS (fl. 1677-1687), *Flores et Fructus Philosophici ex Seraphico Paradiso Excerpti, seu Cursus Philosophicus ad Mentem Sancti Bonaventurae* (1677); *Cursus Theologicus super IV Libros Sententiarum ad Mentem Seraphici Doctoris Sancti Bonaventurae* (1687)

Baconian super-systems (Carmelite)

DIONISIO BLASCO (1610-1683), *Cursus Philosophicus Juxta Doctoris Resoluti Doctrinam* (1672); *Theologia Bacconiana* (1680-1687), 2 vol.

Henricist super-systems (Servite)

BENEDETTO MARIA CANALI (+1743), *Cursus Philosophicus ad Mentem.... Henrici de Gandavo* (1715-1716); *Disputationes Theologicae Juxta Genuinam Henrici de Gandavo Mentem* (1698, completing the work of one LODIGIERI)

Monographers

FRANCISCO DE VITORIA, Dominican (c. 1485-1546), *Relectiones* (1526-1541)

DOMINGO DE SOTO, Dominican (1494-1560), *De Natura et Gratia* (1547); *De Iustitia et Iure* (1556)

MELCHIOR CANO, Dominican (1509-1560), *De Locis Theologicis* (1563)

BARTOLOMÉ DE MEDINA, Dominican (1527-1581), *Commentarii in Primam Secundae* (1577)

LUIS DE MOLINA, Jesuit (1536-1600), *Concordia Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis* (1588)

ROBERT BELLARMINE, Jesuit (1542-1621), *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei* (1586-1593), 4 vol.

TOMÁS SANCHEZ, Jesuit (1550-1610), *De Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento* (1602-1605), 3 vol.

LEONARDUS LESSIUS, Jesuit (1554-1623), *De Perfectionibus Moribusque Divinis* (1620)

DIEGO RUIZ DE MONTOYA, Jesuit (1583-1660), *De Trinitate* (1625)

JUAN DE LUGO, Jesuit (1583-1660), *De Iustitia et Iure* (1646); *De Virtute Fidei Divinae* (1646)

JUAN MARTINEZ DE RIPALDA, Jesuit (1594-1648), *De Ente Supernaturali* (1634-1648), 3 vol.

In the present work we shall concern ourselves not with the theological dimension of the Suarezian super-system, but only with the philosophical, which shall be the topic of the following chapter.

CHAPTER 2
THE PHILOSOPHY OF SUÁREZ[1]

I. THE SUAREZIAN SYSTEM: FOUR THEMES
1. Existence
2. Inclusiveness
3. Being
4. Divinity

II. THE TWO ENLIGHTENMENTS: CATHOLIC & SECULAR
1. Intimate connection between reason and freedom
2. The Catholic Enlightenment and the Catholic Dis-Enlightenment
3. Isabel La Católica, forerunner of the Catholic Enlightenment
4. Scholastic representatives of the Catholic Enlightenment

III. SUÁREZ & FREEDOM
1. Suárez and religious freedom
2. Suárez and political freedom: democracy
3. Suárez and international law
4. Suárez, inspirer of freedom movements

Philosophy is one dimension of the Suarezian super-system, manifested in two facets, metaphysics and ethics (or moral philosophy). On the basis of both these disciplines, with the aid of revelation, the other dimension of the super-system, theology, can be displayed. We noted in the Prologue that Suárez, in his *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, had (as he planned) "laid the foundations of speculative theology; in the

1 This chapter was published in part as "The Achievement of Suárez and the Suarezianization of Thomism," in Adelino Cardoso *et al.*, *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Tradição e Modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 1998. pp. 133-156. This chapter owes much to José Hellin (1883-1973), particularly to his two great syntheses: *La analogía del ser y el conocimiento de Dios en Suárez*. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1947; and *Theologia naturalis*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1950.

same manner…" he had hoped, in his treatise on the soul, *De anima*, "to prepare the way for moral theology…" which would discourse "on the inner knowledge of the soul, its faculties and operations." (That task he was unable to accomplish; the *De anima* was published posthumously in 1628, 11 years after the author's death, apparently revised by a Thomist.)

Basic to this inner knowledge of the soul are reason and freedom, themes that were the focus of the 18th century phenomenon known as the Enlightenment. As we also noted in the Prologue, these themes were equally the preoccupation in the 16th century of a group of thinkers known as the theologians of Salamanca, who debated on the problems dealing with reason and freedom for at least three generations, giving rise to a phenomenon that we identified as the Catholic Enlightenment, a movement that anticipated its secular counterpart by two centuries. Inspired by this movement, of which he was the climax, the Uncommon Doctor was able to uncommonly treat of topics which are crucial to us in the 21st century, such as democracy, international law, religious toleration, and intra-Christian dialogue. We touched on these topics briefly in the Prologue.

As our book focuses on the Doctor's metaphysics, the present chapter will deal mostly with moral philosophy. However as moral philosophy, in his view, has its basis in metaphysics, it will be proper to begin with an outline of the metaphysics of Suárez.

I. THE SUAREZIAN SYSTEM: FOUR THEMES

What constitutes Suarezianism as a distinct and coherent system in the history of thought, may be taken to consist in the concatenation of the following ten features, summarily classified under four themes—existence, inclusiveness, being and divinity—as follows:

I. EXISTENCE
1. Existentiality
2. Singularity
3. Individuation

II. INCLUSIVENESS
4. The metaphysical distinction
5. Non-reification of concepts
6. Complementarity with preeminence

III. BEING
7. Unitary concept
8. Analogy of attribution: God and creature
9. Communication of perfection

IV. DIVINITY
10. The divine nature as subsistent intelligence

In this sequence of themes, we begin with the system's core, the pre-eminence of *existence* (existentiality, singularity, individuation); we then examine notions that express the *inclusiveness* of the core concept, through elimination of unjustified divisions within unities (metaphysical distinction, conceptual non-reification, and complementarity with pre-eminence); which give us access to the more nuanced idea of *being*, or of existence inclusive of essence (unitary concept, analogy, communication of perfection); leading us to the supreme being or *divinity* (whose nature is subsistent intelligence).

1. Existence

Our first major heading is *existence*. It has the first three features: existentiality, singularity and individuation.

First, *existentiality*, the primacy of existence. This primacy in the equation of being has nowhere been stated more forcefully than in the following words (so often quoted in our book) of the Uncommon Doctor:

> Existentia ut existentia correspondet enti ut sic, estque de intrinseca ratione eius, vel in potentia, vel in actu, prout sumptum fuerit ens. Existence, as existence, corresponds to being as such, and pertains to its intrinsic significance, either in potency, or in act, depending on how one considers being.[2]

As we shall see in Chapter 3, being, which corresponds to existence, has two primary senses, actual and aptitudinal, which makes being what may be called a unitary dyad. (Actual and aptitudinal being, in turn, is a duality; so is the binary of essence and existence.)

Second, *singularity*, which logically follows from the first title, the primacy of existence, for all things that do or can exist are singular and individual. To be singular is to be an entity which is undifferentiated

2 *DM* 50: 12: 15 [26: 969].

from itself and differentiated from whatever else exists. Singularity is opposed to plurality: to be at once singular (undifferentiated from itself) and plural (differentiated into many distinct entities which are the same as itself) is a contradiction. The human intellect knows the singular by forming its proper and distinct concept, and through its proper species; and it directly knows material singulars without reflection.[3]

Third, *individuation*, which corresponds to singularity. For Suárez the individual (say, Peter), adds something to the common concept of nature (humanity), by reason of which he is such an individual, not divisible into others such. But what is added is not distinguished from the nature in reality, only in concept. All singular existents are self-individuated, for, as Suárez maintains, "every singular substance is in need of no principle of individuation besides its own entity, or besides the intrinsic principles in which its entity consists."[4]

2. Inclusiveness

Our second major heading is *inclusiveness*, the elimination of unjustified divisions within unities, divisions which are the consequence, Suárez notes, of the tendency to reify concepts, and which can be avoided through the use of the conceptual (or metaphysical) rather than the real distinction. Our heading includes features four to six: the metaphysical distinction, the non-reification of concepts, and complementarity-with-preeminence.

Fourth, then, is the *metaphysical distinction*. "We must be careful," warns Suárez, alerting us to the need of this distinction,

> that we not transfer to the things themselves our own mode of thinking, and because of a different manner of speaking we suppose that there is a difference in the things themselves, where truly there is not.[5]

---

3 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 3. nn. 3, 5, & 7 [3: 722-724].

4 *DM* 5: 6: 1 [25: 180]: omnem substantiam singularem, neque alio indigere individuationis principio praeter suam entitatem, vel praeter principia intrinseca quibus eius entitas constat.

5 *DM* 2: 4: 12 [25: 86]: cavendum est ne modum concipiendi nostrum transferamus ad res ipsas, et propter diversum loquendi modum existimemus esse distinctionem in rebus, ubi vere non est.

The apparent polarity between the unity of the thing signified and the divisions or differences that the mind signifies in it is resolved in the metaphysical distinction, the *distinctio rationis cum fundamento in re*, also known as the *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae* (the distinction of "reasoned reason," as opposed to the *distinctio rationis ratiocinantis*, the distinction of "reasoning reason"). This distinction is one of *reason*, because it does not exist in objective reality, but is constructed by the mind. It is however, *reasoned*, because it is not a mental fabrication, but has a basis in the objective reality itself, a basis consisting in the eminent character of the thing known (the richness of whose meaning cannot be exhausted by a single concept) or in a certain relationship to things that are objectively distinct. Such a distinction of reason,

> is formed through inadequate concepts of the same thing. For although the same thing is conceived by either of the two concepts, by neither is all that is in the thing conceived exactly, nor is its entire essence and its objective significance exhausted, which (process) is often realized through conceiving that thing through a relationship to various other things, or according to their way of being—and so such a distinction always has a basis in reality, but is formally said to come about through inadequate concepts of the same thing. In this way we distinguish justice from mercy in God, because we do not conceive the supreme simplicity of God's power as it is in itself and according to its full value, but we divide it by concepts in relation to various effects, of which that eminent power is the origin; or else by analogy to various powers which we discover to be distinct in men, and which are found in a most eminent way in God's supremely simple power.[6]

6 *DM* 7: 1: 5 [25: 251]: fit per conceptus inadequatos eiusdem rei; nam, licet per utrumque eadem res concipiatur, per neutrum tamen exacte concipitur totum id quod est in re, neque exhauritur tota quidditas et ratio obiectiva eius, quod saepe fit concipiendo rem illam per habitudinem ad res diversas, vel ad modum earum, et ideo talis distinctio semper habet fundamentum in re, formaliter autem dicetur fieri per conceptus inadaequatos eiusdem rei. Sic distinguimus in Deo iustitiam a misericordia, quia non concipimus simplicissimam virtutem Dei prout in se est et secundum totam vim suam, sed eam conceptibus partimur in ordine ad diversos effectus, quorum est principium illa eminens virtus, vel per proportionem ad diversas virtutes, quas in homine invenimus distinctas, et eminentissimo modo reperiuntur unitae in simplicissima virtute Dei.

Fifth, *the non-reification of concepts*. The metaphysical distinction enables us to avoid reifying conceptual distinctions, and thus to preserve identity in difference. Such an inclusive manner of thinking leads Suárez to maintain that there is no real distinction between essence and existence and between material individuator and individuated. There can, but need not be, a real distinction between act and potency, and between mover and moved.

Sixth, *complementarity with preeminence*. Suárez's inclusiveness prompts him to view the constituent dualities of real and of rational being as existing in a relationship where the dualities complement each other, but one of them has the primacy. Existence has two primary senses, actual and aptitudinal, with the actual having the preeminence. Reality has a dual aspect, essence and existence, both forming an integral and indivisible whole, but with existence having the preeminence. That same indivisible reality is *essence*, when it is conceived as constituted within the parameters of real, as distinct from fictitious, being, and as belonging to a particular grade or order of beings; it is *existence*, when it is conceived as the reason for being in the nature of things, outside causes, and outside the mind. Universal and singular describe different aspects of reality, also complementary, but the singular (as we suggested) has the preeminence. Intellect and will are the constituent human faculties; both complement each other, but intellect has the preeminence, though will excels in some respects. In the words of Suárez,

> although the will excels the intellect in freedom, the intellect surpasses the will in reason and in discourse. It is in truth a great perfection for a faculty to be rational by essence, than to be free, for the latter perfection originates as a minor one from the former... It is the intellect that governs the will, and the whole man, rather than the opposite: for although the motivation to activity is from the will, the rectitude of the activity is proposed by the intellect. Consequently, we cannot deny that these faculties are interdependent and mutually helpful, but it is more the will that depends of the intellect, than the intellect on the will.[7]

7 *De anima*, lib. 5, cap. 9, n. 7 [3: 777]: quamvis in libertate voluntas superet intellectum, intellectum superare voluntatem in ratione et discursu; multo vero maior perfectio est potentiam rationalem esse per essentiam, quam esse liberam, haec enim perfectio ex illa oritur tanquam minor... potius enim intellectus regit voluntatem, totumque hominem, quam e contra: nam licet applicatio ad operandum sit a voluntate, rectitudo tamen operandi ab intellectu

One example of how this complementarity-with-preeminence works in Suárez's thought is seen in his treatment of the theological problem of the essence of blessedness, which, as he declares in his treatise *De ultimo fine hominis* (1628), primarily and principally consists in the act of the intellect, the vision of God, in which all the perfection of beatitude is contained as in a fountain and radix: thus, intellect has the preeminence. But there can be no beatitude without the influx of the will, for charity and divine friendship are absolutely necessary for perfect supernatural blessedness. The resultant complementarity of the intellect with the will is thus explained:

> the will and the intellect are so compared, that the will exceeds the intellect in some qualities, that is, in the aspect of moving towards action and as regards freedom; yet the intellect nonetheless is absolutely the perfect faculty. In this manner are vision and love with respect to God, for love excels in so far as it moves and orders everything to God as to its end, and yet vision absolutely excels in so far as it manifests divine eminence, and causes and directs love itself.[8]

3. Being

Our third major heading is *being and its kinds*. It has features seven to nine: unitary concept, analogy of attribution between God and the creature, and the communication of perfection.

Seventh, *the unitary concept of being*, which brings us to Suárez's solution of the problem of the One and the Many, the solution being based on the conceptual distinction *rationis ratiocinatae*. (We shall be discussing this topic more fully in Chapter 3.) Being for Suárez is *simpliciter, licet imperfecte, unum, et secundum quid diversum*. In clarifying this view the *Doctor Eximius* distinguishes (as we noted in the Prologue) two kinds of concepts, the formal, or the vital act of the mind

---

proponitur. Ex quo negare non possumus has potentias inter se dependentiam habere, seque mutuo iuvare, plus tamen est quod voluntas intellectui, quam quod intellectus voluntati.

8 *De ultimo fine hominis*, disp. 7, sect. 1, n. 56 [4: 87]: voluntas et intellectus ita comparantur, ut voluntas excedat in aliquibus proprietatibus, scilicet in ratione moventis quoad usum, et quoad libertatem, et nihilominus intellectus est simpliciter perfectior: ita etiam visio et amor se habent respectu Dei, nam amor excedit ratione moventis et ordinantis omnia in Deum ut in finem: nihilominus visio simpliciter superat in ratione manifestantis divinam excellentiam, et causantis ac dirigentis ipsum amorem.

by which it knows something, and the objective, or what it knows through the formal concept. As experience tells us, the formal concept of "being" is one, not many. The two concepts are complementary, and to the formal concept,

> there corresponds an objective concept, adequate and immediate, which expressly signifies neither substance nor accident, nor God nor creature, but all these in the manner of a unity, that is to say, in so far as they are in some way similar and concur in existing[9]... this objective concept is mentally distinct from all its particulars, or members dividing being, even though they be entirely simple entities.[10]

It is clear then that

> the significance of being is transcendent, and intimately enclosed in all the particular and determinate types of being, and in the very modes determining being itself. And therefore, although the common concept [of being as such], as abstract, is one in itself, however, the reasons constituting the particular beings are diverse, and by them, as such, each is constituted absolutely in the existence of being. Then... the common concept of itself postulates such a determination with the order and relationship to one [or to a single Being]; and therefore, just as this concept is one, it is not altogether the same, because it is not of itself altogether uniform—a uniformity and identity which the univocal concepts require in their meaning—and it is in this manner that the definition of univocal concepts ought to be explained.[11]

---

9 *DM* 22: 2: 8 [25: 72]: conceptui formali entis respondere unum conceptum obiectivum adaequatum et immediatum, qui expresse non dicit substantiam neque accidens, neque Deum nec creaturam, sed haec omnia per modum unius, scilicet quatenus sunt inter se aliquo modo similia, et coveniunt in essendo.

10 *DM* 22: 2: 15 [25: 75]: hic conceptus obiectivus est secundum rationem praecisus ab omnibus particularibus, seu membris dividentibus ens, etiamsi si sint maxime simplices entitates.

11 *DM* 26: 3: 21 [26: 21]: rationem entis esse transcendentem, et intime inclusam in omnibus propriis ac determinatis rationibus entium, et in ipsis modis determinantibus ipsum ens, ideoque licet ratio communis, ut abstracta, sit in se una, tamen rationes constituentes singula entia esse diversas, et per illas ut sic constitui unumquodque absolute in esse entis. Deinde... ipsamet ratio communis ex se postulat talem determinationem cum ordine et habitudine ad unum, et ideo, licet secundum confusam rationem sit eadem, sicut est una, nihilominus non est omnino eadem, quia non est ex se omnino

How is this simple unitary concept of being contracted to its particulars, like substance and accident, God and creature? In his reply, Suárez introduces the idea, distinctive of his thought, of the *expressior conceptus*, which proposes an entirely original solution to the problem of the One and the Many. The contraction or determination of the unitary objective concept of being as such to its particulars, says the Uncommon Doctor,

> is not to be understood in the manner of a composition, but in the manner of a more express conception of any particular being contained under [the abstract unitary concept of] being; in such a way that both concepts, of being [as such] and of substance, for example, may be simple, and irresoluble into two concepts, differing only in that one is more determined than the other... by one concept the thing is more expressly conceived, as it is in itself, than it is by the other concept, through which it is conceived only confusedly and precisively according to any conformity it has with other things. All this can come about without composition properly speaking, by the sole knowledge that it is confused [in the one instance] and distinct [in the other], precisive [in the one case] or determined [in the other].[12]

Eighth, *analogy* (*of attribution*), which follows upon the concept of the unity of being, whose lack of uniformity entails the inequality of attribution, that is, of some varieties of being as dependent on others (or on Another), so much so that the totality of being incorporates a relationship or order of essential dependence, for

> being itself, howsoever confusedly conceived, by its nature demands this order, that it firstly, by itself and as though completely, apply to God, and by that [relationship] descend to other things, in which it

---

uniformis, quam uniformitatem et identitatem requirunt univoca in ratione sua, et ita debet definitio univocorum exponi.

12 *DM* 2: 6: 7 [25: 100-101]: hanc contractionem seu determinationem conceptus obiectivi entis ad inferiora non esse intelligendam per modum compositionis, sed solum per modum expressioris conceptionis alicuius entis contenti sub ente; ita ut uterque conceptus, tam entis quam substantiae, verbi gratia, simplex sit, et irresolubilis in duos conceptus, solumque differant, quia unus est magis determinatus quam alius... per unum expressius concipitur res, prout est in se, quam per alium, quo solum confuse concipitur, et praecise secundum aliquam convenientiam cum aliis rebus; hoc autem totum fieri potest sine propria compositione per solam cognitionem confusam vel distinctam, praecisam vel determinatam.

> is not contained, except with a relationship to and dependence on God.[13]

This is because the creature

> is essentially being by the participation of its existence, which in God is by essence as in the first and universal fountain, from which any participation of itself derives to all the others. Every creature is therefore being by some relationship to God, that is, in so far as it participates or in some way imitates God's being. Moreover, in so far as it has being, it essentially depends on God, much more than accident depends on substance. In this way being is affirmed of the creature by a relationship or attribution to God.[14]

This analogy of attribution is qualified by its two major categories, *God and the creature*. These categories contain an immediate contradiction, and no being can avoid belonging to one or other of them. The division is therefore adequate and sufficient, and can be expressed through other equivalent dual concepts: as increate and created being, being by essence and being by participation, and pure act and being in potency. Equally universal is the division of being into substance and accident, but that of God and creature has the priority, because created being is further removed from the increate, than accident is from substance.

This primary diversity, God and the creature, or "being by essence" and "being by participation" is fundamental to Suarezian metaphysics. From the concept of "being by essence" are derived, *a priori*, all the predicates characteristic of God: infinity, unicity, immutability, imitability in effects—the latter predicate being the *a priori* reason for the possibility itself of "being by participation." From the latter concept, in turn, are derived, *a priori*, all the predicates that characterize the

13 *DM* 28: 3: 17 [26: 19]: ipsum ens quantumvis abstracte et confuse conceptum, ex vi sua postulat hunc ordinem, ut primo ac per se, et quasi complete competat Deo, et per illud descendat ad reliqua, quibus non insit, nisi cum habitudine et dependentia a Deo...

14 *DM* 28: 3: 16 [26: 18]: creatura essentialiter est ens per participationem eius esse, quod in Deo est per essentiam ut in primo et universali fonte, ex quo ad omnia alia derivatur aliqua eius participatio; omnis ergo creatura est ens per aliquam habitudinem ad Deum, quatenus scilicet participat vel aliquo modo imitatur esse Dei, et quatenus habet esse, essentialiter pendet a Deo, multo magis quam pendeat accidens a substantia. Hoc igitur modo dicitur ens de creatura per habitudinem seu attributionem ad Deum.

creature, which are: contingence, dependence in conservation and activity, finiteness, potentiality by itself and in combination with act, the multiplication of beings into species and into individuals within each species, univocal similarities of genus and species, and the analogical similarities between substance and accidents, and also between Creator and creature. In this way the absolute simplicity of "being by essence" is the *a priori* reason for the endless variety and multiplicity of "being by participation." The concept of "being by essence" is thus the unifying principle of Suarezianism; it defines the basis of what, to the Uncommon Doctor's mind, constitutes the simple and comprehensive structure behind the various modes of Scholasticism.

Ninth, *communication of perfection*, another unifying principle in the Suarezian system, and also describable as the self-diffusion of the good, for, as the *Doctor Eximius* declares,

> God is usually named good, in a primary sense, from the plenitude of all perfection, and in so far as He is disposed, through His plenitude, to extend and communicate Himself to others to whom He can be good[15]... [For] divine goodness is the fountain whence all other things participate in goodness, and from which they all depend for their goodness.[16]

Suárez has a complicated theory of communication, which can be simplified as follows.[17]

COMMUNICATION FOR GOOD OF COMMUNICATOR & COMMUNICATED
  Matter & form
COMMUNICATION FOR GOOD OF COMMUNICATED
  Which results in privation in the communicator: in generation
  Which implies no privation in communicator
    Within the divine being: the Trinity
    Outside the divine being

15 *De Deo Uno*, lib. 1, cap. 8, n. 18 [1: 26]: Praecipue vero solet denominari Deus bonus ex plenitudine omnis perfectionis, et quatenus ex plenitudine eius propensus est ad se diffundendum et communicandum aliis, quibus bonus esse potest...

16 *De Deo uno*, lib. 1, cap. 8, n. 13 [1: 25]: nam divina bonitas est fons unde omnia alia bonitatem participant, et a qua omnia in sua bonitate pendent.

17 *De Incarnatione*, q. 1, art. 1. Commentarius, nn. 5-10 [17: 34-35].

In the natural order: creation
In the supernatural order: grace & beatific vision

Communication is either for the good of both communicator and communicated, or for the good of the communicated thing alone. An example of the former type is matter communicating itself to form, form to matter, and both to their composite. This kind cannot apply to God, because it presupposes deficiency and imperfection in the communicator.

Communication for the good of the communicated thing is of two kinds: one which results in privation in the communicator, and the other which implies no such privation. An example of the former is generation among living creatures, whereby, in generating a son, a father loses some of his substance. This kind is inapplicable to God, who loses nothing in communicating. The second kind of communication—which implies no privation in the communicator—is proper to God, as it accords with His infinite perfection.

Such communication is made within the divine being or outside it. *Within the divine being* it obtains in the Trinity of Persons, where the Father communicates to the Son the identical Godhead and essential perfection of the divine nature without lessening His own perfection, and He communicates not out of any lack or for acquiring added perfection to Himself, but rather from a plenitude of perfection.

Outside the divine being this communication obtains in the natural and supernatural orders. In the natural order, through creation, where too the perfection is communicated, the immense variety of created being does not diminish the perfection of the communicator, but only confers it on the recipients of the communication. In the supernatural order, through grace and the Beatific Vision, which elevate the creature to an intellective connaturality with the divine nature; and through the hypostatic union, where what is communicated to the created nature is the personality and substance of the Godhead itself.

4. Divinity

Our fourth and last major heading is also our tenth and last feature, *divine intellectuality*. We have seen how, for Suárez, of the two faculties, intellect and will, intellect is the more perfect. This belief conditions his thought on God's essence or nature, which he identifies not as subsistent being, as is frequent among the Scholastics, but as subsistent

intellection. When discoursing about the life of God, which is intellectual, Suárez declares that God

> has the intellectual life by essence and not by participation. To have by essence is nothing else but to have the intellectual life itself in the manner of pure and ultimate actuality without any efficiency or causality. And this is nothing else but that the divine essence is intellectual, not in the manner of intellectual principle or basis, but as subsistent intellection itself. But the intellection and knowledge of God are most formally the same: therefore actual knowledge by essence is so to speak the ultimate essential constitutive form of the divine nature. And so, conceiving as we do any intellectual nature in a twofold manner, either because it has an intrinsic relationship to intellection, or because it is intellection itself, we conceive of created intellectual nature in the former mode... But the divine nature is intellectual in the latter manner, because this mode is characteristic of God, that is to say, because He is the most pure and abstract [i.e. abstracted from matter] intellection itself. Therefore, in this way, God's knowledge most formally constitutes and as it were specifies His essence.[18]

This topic will be examined at length in Chapter 4.

18 *DM* 30: 15: 15 [26: 174]: [Deus] habet illam vitam intellectualem per essentiam, et non per participationem; habere autem per essentiam, non est aliud quam habere ipsam intellectualem [vitam] per modum puri et ultimi actus absque ulla effectione vel causalitate. At hoc non est aliud quam quod divina essentia sit intellectualis, non per modum principii aut radicis intellectualis, sed ut ipsamet intellectio subsistens; sed intellectio et scientia Dei idem formalissime sunt; ergo actualis scientia per essentiam est veluti ultimum essentiale constitutivum divinae naturae. Itaque, cum dupliciter concipiatur a nobis quod aliqua natura sit intellectualis, scilicet, quia habet intrinsecam habitudinem ad intelligere, vel quia est ipsum intelligere, priori modo concipimus naturam creatam esse intellectualem... Divina vero natura est intellectualis posteriori modo, quia est proprius eius, scilicet, quia est ipsum intelligere purissimum et abstractissimum. Sic igitur scire Dei formalissime constituit et quasi specificat eius essentiam.

II. THE TWO ENLIGHTENMENTS, CATHOLIC AND SECULAR

1. Intimate connection between reason & freedom

We return to the Uncommon Doctor's moral philosophy and to his connection with the Catholic Enlightenment and its focus on reason and freedom. The Catholic reason is not the autonomous faculty, divorced from revelation, of the Age of Reason: its natural light is intensified by the supernatural light of faith. Yet reason is able by its own power to establish the foundations of theology, because it "explains and confirms those natural principles which encompass all things, and in some way support and sustain all doctrine..." For in the study of theology, metaphysical doctrines obtain,

> without whose knowledge and understanding the loftier mysteries can hardly or not at all be treated in a worthy manner. Thus, these metaphysical principles and truths cohere with theological conclusions and discourses, in such a way that if the knowledge and perfect understanding of the former be removed, the understanding of the latter is necessarily impaired.[19]

Both reason and freedom are intimately connected,

> because freedom rises from the intelligence, or [to put it in another way] vital appetite follows knowledge, and hence a more perfect appetite [such as is found in intellectual beings] accompanies a more perfect knowledge. Therefore to a knowledge that is universal and in its own way indifferent there follows also an appetite that is universal and indifferent.[20]

The indifference of the intellect, the seat of reason, lies in its not being necessitated to accord equal value to all that it knows. It judges about ends and means, weighs what in them is good or bad, useful or

19 *DM* Proemium [25: 1]: sine quorum cognitione et intelligentia vix, aut ne vix quidem, possunt altiora illa mysteria pro dignitate tractari... Ita enim haec principia et veritates metaphysicae cum theologicis conclusionibus ac discursibus cohaerent, ut si illorum scientia ac perfecta cognitio auferatur, horum etiam scientiam nimium labefactari necesse sit.

20 *DM* 19: 2: 17 [25: 698]: quia libertas ex intelligentia nascitur, nam appetitus vitalis sequitur cognitionem, et ideo perfectiorem cognitionem comitatur perfectior appetitus; ergo et cognitionem universalem et suo modo indifferentem sequitur etiam appetitus universalis et indifferens...

useless, what is and is not needed to achieve ends. So too the appetite that follows from this knowledge is not necessitated to accept all the good that is presented to it, but only relative to the importance that any particular good is judged to have. The good that is not judged to be necessary is therefore accepted or desired freely. Hence free choice follows rational deliberation, *ad rationalem consultationem sequitur electio libera*.[21]

Furthermore, in being free, the creature participates in God's eminent freedom. And freedom is the basis of the creature's ultimate participation, achieved through grace, in God's inner life. For the free nature is the foundation of grace and the principle of moral operations, by which eternal blessedness is attained or lost.[22]

Freedom is innate to man, for man is born free, *homo nascitur liber*.[23] Later, a prominent representative of the secular Enlightenment, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), was to use the same words: *L'homme est né libre, et partout il est dans les fers*.[24] Furthermore, no man is naturally another man's master, *nullus habet iurisdictionem politicam in alium*.[25] Rousseau: *aucun homme n'a une autorité naturelle sur son semblable*.[26] Indeed, *libertas est homini naturalis, et magna eius perfectio; unde illa privari magna poena et miseria est*, "freedom is natural to man, and his great perfection; hence to be deprived of it is a great penalty and misery."[27] Yet Suárez is no abolitionist; like many other theologians of his time, he holds that slavery is permissible under certain conditions.

21 *DM* 19: 2: 17 [25: 698].

22 *De gratia, Prolegomenon* I, cap. 1, n. 1 [7: 1].

23 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*,, lib. 3, cap. 2, n. 9 [24: 209].

24 Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Du contrat social: ou, principes du droit politique*, 1762, liv. 1, chap. 1.

25 *De legibus*, lib. 3, cap. 2, n. 3 [5: 180].

26 Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Du contrat social*, liv. 1, chap. 4.

27 *De opere sex dierum*, lib. 5, cap. 7, n. 10 [3: 416].

2. The Catholic Enlightenment and the Catholic Dis-Enlightenment

The theological reexamination of the importance of reason and freedom began with the conquest of parts of the New World by the Spaniards (and of parts of the old world by the Portuguese) from the late 15th century. In response to this phenomenon, two intellectual moments arose in counterpoint: the Catholic Enlightenment, as we have called it, and its counterpart, which deserves no better title than the Catholic "Dis-Enlightenment." (The theoretical positions of both movements are presented in detail by Juan de Solórzano Pereira, 1575-1655, in his monumental *De Indiarum jure*, Madrid 1777, who himself tends to favor the Dis-Enlightenment.) Among the protagonists of the latter movement are Juan de Palácios Rubios (c. 1450-1524), the ideologue of Christian imperialism; Juan de Sepúlveda (c. 1490-1573), the ideologue of political oppression; and García de Toledo (c. 1515-1590), the ideologue of economic exploitation. If we combine their salient views, a philosophy such as the following emerges:

> Though infidels, the native Americans (in abstract theory) have a right to liberty, ownership and immunity from aggression, as well as to political authority and economic independence. But they can be deprived of these rights if they are uncivilized, debar missionaries from their lands, and reject the suzerainty of the Church, which is invested in the Pope. Indeed, the sovereignty exercised by the Amerindians may be characterized as illegitimate, and Spaniards can claim to have a God-given right to be their rulers. Oppression of the American natives is justified in view of their infidelity, which requires that they be converted; and of their depravity, which is evinced by their human sacrifices and cannibalism. They can also be economically exploited, to produce the wealth that can pay for the expenses of their own conversion, and of the wars against the infidels in the Old World.

The contrary movement, the Catholic Enlightenment, had far more numerous followers, and by far the more brilliant intellects. Among the forerunners of the movement are the Franciscan Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros (1436-1517), the queen Isabel la Católica (1451-1504), and the Dominicans Pedro de Córdoba (1482-1525) and Bartolomé de las Casas (1484-1566).

3. Isabel La Católica, forerunner of the Catholic Enlightenment

Isabel, counseled by her confessor Cisneros (1436-1517), is arguably the forerunner of the movement. In her instructions, emitted from 1493 to1504, this great queen, whose one preoccupation was justice to her subjects, decreed that the conquered American natives were to be treated with affection, and that their abusers were to be sternly punished.[28] Up to 1499, she was hesitant about slavery, sometimes permitting it, but in 1500 she had made up her mind. In her instruction to a royal official, she noted that some Amerindians were sequestered, and sold in various places by the Admiral of the Indies. "These Indians are now to be freed," she commanded, "and we have ordered the *Comendador*… to take them back to the Indies."[29] If a precise date is needed to mark the start of the Catholic Enlightenment, the opponent of slavery and promoter of freedom, then 1500 is as good as any other. Isabel reaffirmed her conviction in her *Codicil* of 1504, the year of her death.

A group of fervent Dominicans—revulsed by the treatment of the natives by their oppressors, the rapacious colonists—raised their voices in the defense of the oppressed. Among them was Pedro de Córdoba (1482-1525), who boldly declared that the Indies were to be de-colonized; that all the colonists were to leave except the missionaries, who were not to make forced conversions. It was preferable for the natives to live as healthy pagans than as enslaved Christians doomed to die; it was better for them to continue as infidels than to blaspheme Christianity because of the scandalous lives of the Spanish Christians.[30] Bartolomé de Las Casas (1484-1566), the most eloquent and effective advocate of the abused American natives, turned the tables on the abusers, proclaiming the nobility of the Amerindians and declaring that it was the Spaniards who were depraved, and that

28 Isabel la Católica, "Royal Instructions to Columbus for the Second Voyage," 1493. John H. Pary & Robert G. Keith, *New Iberian World*, vol. 2, *The Carribean*, p. 72.

29 Isabel la Católica, "Decree Ordering the Release and Return of Indian Slaves Brought from the Islands," 1500. John H. Pary & Robert G. Keith, *New Iberian World*, vol. 2, *The Carribean*, p. 242.

30 Pedro de Córdoba, "Carta de los Dominicos," April-May 1517. *Colección de documentos ineditos… de America e Oceania*, vol. 2, pp. 211-212.

the beliefs and customs of the natives were quite plausible. He advocated evangelization by peaceful means alone, and strongly condemned war, which he described as intrinsically evil. He also denounced the so-called punishment of the natives for their alleged crimes against the natural law. To maltreat them was to scourge and crucify Christ Himself. Las Casas asserted that the natives could if they wished accept the suzerainty of the Spanish monarch, after which they would continue to live as free men.[31]

4. Scholastic representatives of the Catholic Enlightenment

As a disciplined intellectual movement making use of the Scholastic method, the Catholic Enlightenment begins with the theologians of Salamanca, who are too numerous to mention. We may, however, refer to the Dominicans Francisco de Vitoria (c. 1483-1546), the movement's Scholastic inaugurator, Mancio de Corpus Christi (1495-1576) and Melchior Cano (1509-1560), who belong to the first generation of these theologians. Among those of the second generation are the Dominicans Bartolomé de Medina (1528-1581), Domingo Báñez (1528-1604), the Augustinian Luis de León (1527-1591), and the Jesuits Luis de Molina (1535-1600) and Francisco Suárez, the consummator of the movement.

III. SUÁREZ AND FREEDOM

1. Suárez and religious freedom

Freedom was the particular focus of the Catholic Enlightenment. Of the modes in which freedom can express itself, two are especially prominent, the religious and the political. On both these modes, Suárez has clear opinions.

---

31 These ideas and others are expressed in Bartolomé de las Casas in his *Apologetica historia sumaria*/A Brief Apologetic History (1553), published three years after his famous "debate" with Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (c. 1490-1572?), an apologist for the oppression of the Amerindians. See also Franklin W. Knight (ed,) & Andrew Hurley (trans.) *Bartolomé de las Casas. An Account, Much Abbreviated, of the Destruction of the Indies with Related Texts.* Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2003.

First, as regards *religious freedom*. Suárez distinguishes three types of individuals who can enjoy this freedom, non-apostate infidels, apostates and heretics. Apostates and heretics were to be allowed no freedom, so Suárez's ideas of religious tolerance cannot be said to conform to present-day standards. However, he is eloquent about the freedom of non-apostate infidels; in discussing which he lays down principles—such as the free, spontaneous (and, indeed, supernatural) character of faith—which can be logically be extended to justify tolerance for apostates and heretics also.

It is not permissible, argues Suárez, to coerce infidels to convert, for

> such a method of drawing men to the faith is not an appropriate one for the Church; it is far more advantageous that the reception and profession of faith be absolutely and entirely spontaneous. First, so that the efficacy of the divine word and of God's grace be manifested in this work [of conversion], as it is especially the work of God... Second, because this method of coercion is exposed to several disadvantages, as pretended conversions and innumerable sacrileges would morally result from it. Besides, infidels would be greatly scandalized and blaspheme the Christian religion if they were to be driven by human compulsion to that religion which is wholly supernatural.[32]

Even in a Christian state force cannot be employed to compel belief, for

> even though the supreme temporal power of that state exists in a Christian ruler, nonetheless that power does not extend to the act of punishing those subjects for the sin of not accepting the Faith which has been sufficiently proposed to them. As that authority is derived directly from men, it is ordered toward a natural end, chiefly the preservation of the peace of the state, for natural justice, and for the honesty accordant with such an end. Its punishment, therefore,

32 *De fide*, disp. 18, sect. 3, n. 6 [12: 446]: modus ille trahendi homines ad fidem non erat conveniens Ecclesiae, sed multo magis expediebat ut prima fidei susceptio et professio esset simpliciter et omnino spontanea: primo, ut efficacia verbi divini et gratiae Dei in hoc opere ostenderetur, quia est maxime opus Dei... Secundo, quia modus ille coactionis erat expositus multis incommodis; nam ex eo moraliter sequerentur simulatae conversiones et innumera sacrilegia; infideles etiam plurimum scandalizarentur, et religionem christianam blasphemarent, si ad illam, quae supernaturalis omnino est, per humanam potentiam cogerentur...

> does not pertain to that authority; therefore, too, neither can the power to coerce the acceptance of the Faith be legitimately usurped by virtue of that authority.[33]

If Christianity is introduced by force into infidel lands, their inhabitants have the right to engage in a just war against their aggressors:

> because if preachers are sent with an army, those to whom they are sent will—in a moral sense, and not without apparent reason—presume that the preachers are sent to occupy their territory rather than to procure their spiritual salvation. Hence, speaking even by rule, they can, according to a prudent presumption, justly defend themselves. Therefore the occasion to a just war is given, and the matter [on the part of the invaders] reduced to one of aggression rather than of defense. And if the invaded party cannot resist, and submits through fear, in that case it already is the highest kind of compulsion. This argument can be confirmed as follows: because such a means [that of military intervention] is not an apt one for introducing the Faith, as it leads to insult and disgrace. For the unbelievers will think that our Faith gives license for violating the law of nations, indeed even the law of nature, in occupying the lands of others against their owners' will, and of waging war without just reason. Hence they will become even more obdurate and more indisposed to accept the Faith. So such a manner of introducing the preaching of the Faith is not a legitimate one.[34]

---

33 *De fide*, disp. 18, sect. 3, n. 7 [12: 446-447]: etiamsi suprema potestas temporalis talis reipublicae in principe christiano existat; nihilominus tamen illa potestas non extenditur ad hunc actum puniendi subditos propter peccatum non suscipiendi fidem ipsis sufficienter propositam, quia illa potestas sicut est proxime ab hominibus, ita solum ordinatur ad naturalem finem, et praesertim ad servandam pacem reipublicae, et naturalem iustitiam ac honestatem ad illum finem convenientem. At vero illud peccatum infidelitatis est omnino extra illum ordinem et finem; ergo punitio illius ad talem potestatem non pertinet; ergo neque coactio ad suscipiendam fidem licite usurpari potest ex vi talis potestatis...

34 *De fide*, disp. 18, sect. 1, n. 9 [12: 440]: quia si praedicatores mittantur cum exercitu, illi ad quos mittuntur, morali modo, et non sine apparenti ratione, praesument mitti potius ad occupandam provinciam, quam ad procurandam salutem spiritualem eorum. Unde loquendo etiam regulariter, iuste defendi poterunt, iuxta prudentem praesumptiomem; ergo datur illis occasio iusti belli, et ita illa reducitur potius ad aggressionem quam ad defensionem. Quod si alii non possint resistere, et timore cedant, iam illa est maxima coactio. Unde confirmatur, quia illud medium non est aptum ad introducendam

These ideas (evidently extended to "apostates" and "heretics") were developed in the Declaration of Religious Liberty, *Dignitatis humanae*, promulgated by the general council of Vatican II on December 7, 1965, part of the text of which we referred to in the Prologue.

2. Suárez and political freedom: democracy

Second, as regards *political freedom*, Suárez's speculation on this theme entitles him to be named the theologian and philosopher of (pre-political) democracy and of law, especially international law. His thoughts on democracy include those of the origin of authority, and on how it can be transferred to, or reclaimed from, specific or positive forms of government—which are three: monarchy, or rule by a single individual; aristocracy, or rule by the few; and democracy, or rule by the many or by the people.

Political authority, declares Suárez, derives from God and resides immediately in a community or congregation of men united by a common will and directed to a single goal, the common good:

> by the very fact that men are gathered together in one city or state, there results in their community, without the intervention of any created will, this kind of [political] authority, and with so great a necessity, that it cannot be obstructed by the human will. It is a sign therefore that the authority is immediately from God, there intervening only that natural consequence or effect, as follows from nature and the dictates of natural reason.[35]

Authority vested in the people is democracy. Does this mean that democracy is divinely instituted? Suárez responds by distinguishing

---

fidem, nam cedit in iniuriam et infamiam eius; existimabunt enim infideles nostram fidem dare licentiam violandi iura gentium, imo et ius naturae, occupando res alienas, invitis dominis, et inferendo bellum sine titulo iusto. Unde duriores etiam fient, et magis indispositi ad fidem suscipiendam; non est ergo licitus ille modus introducendi praedicationem fidei.

35 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*, lib. 3, cap. 3, n. 13 [24: 216]: eo ipso quod homines in corpus unius civitatis vel reipublicae congregantur, sine interventu alicuius creatae voluntatis resultat in illa communitate talis potestas, cum tanta necessitate, ut non possit per voluntatem humanam impediri; signum proinde est esse immediate a Deo, interveniente solum illa naturali resultantia seu consecutione ex natura et dictamine rationis naturalis...

between democracy as a spontaneous quasi-natural (pre-political) institution, and as a structured and positive one. If the question

> is understood of the positive institution, the conclusion [that democracy is divinely instituted] must be denied. If it is understood of the quasi-natural institution, it can and ought to be admitted without any inconvenience... Monarchy and aristocracy could not have been introduced without a positive divine or human institution, because natural reason alone does not determine that any of the types of government referred to are necessary... Therefore since, in human nature considered in itself, apart from faith or divine revelation, a positive institution has no place, it must necessarily be concluded of those two types [monarchy and aristocracy], that they are not immediately from God. But democracy can exist without positive institution, and only from natural institution or development, with the sole negation of a new and positive institution, because natural reason itself declares that the supreme political power naturally flows from an autonomous human community, unless it is transferred to another person through a new institution.[36]

There indeed exists a positive institution divinely founded, the papacy: a clear difference obtains between its supernatural authority and the temporal authority of the state, which in its positive form is not of divine origin, but derives from the people.

However, once the people, exercising its liberty, has used its power to transfer authority to a monarch (or to an aristocratic body), this people

---

36 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*, lib. 3, cap. 2, n. 8 [24: 209]: si hoc intelligatur de institutione positiva, negandam esse consecutionem; si vero intelligatur de institutione quasi naturali, sine ullo inconveniente admitti posse et debere... monarchia et aristocratia introduci non potuerunt sine positiva institutione divina vel humana, quia sola naturalis ratio nude sumpta non determinat aliquam ex dictis speciebus ut necessariam... unde, cum in humana natura, per se spectata absque fide seu revelatione divina, non habeat locum positiva institutio, de illis speciebus necessario concluditur, non esse immediate a Deo. At vero democratia esse posset absque institutione positiva, ex sola naturali institutione seu dimanatione, cum sola negatione novae seu positivae institutionis, quia ipsa ratio naturalis dictat, potestatem politicam supremam naturaliter sequi ex humana communitate perfecta, et ex vi eiusdem rationis ad totam communitatem pertinere, nisi per novam institutionem in alium transferatur...

> will not with justice, basing itself on that same power, and without the decision of an arbiter, arrogate to itself that liberty as often as it pleases. For if it conceded its power to the king, and which he accepted, by that very fact the king acquired his authority. Therefore although the king received that authority by donation or by contract from the people, it will neither be right for the people to take it away from the king, nor to take possession of its liberty again.[37]

But if the king acts tyrannically, Suárez admits of a right to revolution, that is, the right of the people to wage a just war against their king. As the Doctor states it:

> the war of the state against the ruler, even if it be aggressive, is not intrinsically evil, but it must have the conditions of a just war to be honorable. The conclusion is only justified when the ruler is a tyrant... [then] the entire state, and any of its members, has a right against him. Hence any one can liberate the state from tyranny. The reason is, because the tyrant is an aggressor, and unfairly wages war against the state and its individual members; so to all belongs the right of defense... The whole state is above the king, for since it was the one which gave him his authority, it is assumed to have given it on the condition that he would rule in a statesmanlike and not tyrannical manner, else it could depose him.[38]

---

37 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*, lib. 3, cap. 3, n. 2 [24: 213]: postquam populus suam potestatem in regem transtulit, non potest iuste, eadem potestate fretus, suo arbitrio, seu quoties voluerit, se in libertatem vendicare. Nam si potestatem suam regi concessit, quam ille acceptavit, eo ipso rex dominium acquisivit; ergo quamvis rex habuerit a populo illud dominium per donationem vel contractum, non ideo licebit populo dominium illud regis auferre, nec libertatem suam iterum usurpare.

38 *De charitate*, disp. 13, sect. 8, n. 2 [12: 759]: bellum reipublicae contra principem, etiamsi sit aggressivum, non est intrinsece malum; habere tamen debet conditiones iusti alias belli, ut honestetur. Conclusio solum habet locum, quando princeps est tyrannus... [tunc] tota respublica, et quodlibet eius membrum ius habet contra illum: unde quilibet potest se ac rempublicam a tyrannide vendicare. Ratio est, quia tyrannus ille aggressor est, et inique bellum movet contra rempublicam, et singula membra eius; unde omnibus competit ius defensionis... tota respublica superior est rege; nam cum ipsa dederit illi potestatem, ea conditione dedisse censetur, ut politice, non tyrannice regeret, alias ab ipsa posse deponi.

We can speculate that words such as these, directly or indirectly, inspired the five revolutions we mentioned in the Prologue: the Portuguese (1640), English(1688), American (1776), French (1789) and Mexican (1810).

3. Suárez and international law

But does this community of men, this natural democracy, divinely invested with authority, consist of all the members of the human race together? Suárez thinks not. In his words,

> this power does not in the nature of things exist in the multitude of men in such a way that it has to be numerically singular in the whole species, or in the total collection of men existing in the entire earth. Because it is not necessary for conservation or for natural good that all men be gathered together into one political community, indeed, it was hardly possible and much less convenient.[39]

For the larger a community is, the more difficult it is to govern; most difficult it will be to bring the whole world under one government. It appears then that the authority in question never embraced the entire human race, and that it was always divided among separate communities. But that does not make the communities unrelated units, as all their members still belong to the human species. And "the human race," observes the Uncommon Doctor,

> although divided into various peoples and kingdoms, always has a certain unity, which is not only specific [i.e. as a species], but also, as it were, political and moral, which the natural precept of mutual love and mercy proclaims, a precept that extends to all, even to strangers, and of any condition whatsoever. Hence, although each autonomous city, state or kingdom be in itself a complete community, and made up of its members, nonetheless any one of them is also a member in some way of this world, in so far as it belongs to the human race. For these communities will never singly be so sufficient to themselves that they will not need mutual help and fellowship, as well as communication, sometimes for a better mode

39 *De legibus*, lib. 3, cap. 2, n. 5 [5: 181]: hanc potestatem non ita esse ex natura rei in multitudine hominum, ut necessario sit una numero in tota specie, seu in tota collectione hominum existentium in universo orbe. Quia necessarium non est ad conservationem aut bonum naturae ut omnes homines ita congregentur in una politica communitate, imo vix erat id possibile, et multo minus erat expediens.

> of life and greater usefulness, sometimes indeed out of moral necessity and need, as the actual state of affairs [in the world] makes clear. For this reason they will need some law, by which they can be directed and rightly ordered in this kind of communication and fellowship.[40]

With these words, Suárez develops the philosophy of international law, the idea of which he had received from his great forerunner Francisco de Vitoria (c. 1485-1546) and which was to be given a more rigorous form by Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), who described his Jesuit predecessor as a man *in philosophia... tantae subtilitatis, ut vix quemquam habeat parem*.[41]

4. Suárez inspirer of freedom movements

The subtlety extolled by Grotius—along with the comprehensiveness, systematic rigor and elegance of Suárez's presentation of the rationale of freedom—was destined not to remain just an academic exercise but to impact Western nations on both sides of the Atlantic, inspiring the five "revolutions" or uprisings against kingly oppression mentioned above. These uprisings and their intellectual leaders are as follows:

---

40 *De legibus*, lib. 2, cap. 19, n. 9 [5: 169]: humanum genus, quantumvis in varios populos et regna divisum, semper habet aliquam unitatem, non solum specificam, sed etiam quasi politicam et moralem, quam indicat naturale praeceptum mutui amoris et misericordiae, quod ad omnes extenditur, etiam extraneos, et cuiuscumque rationis. Quapropter, licet unaquaeque civitas perfecta, respublica aut regnum, sit in se communitas perfecta, et suis membris constans, nihilominus quaelibet illarum est etiam membrum aliquo modo huius universi, prout ad genus humanum spectat: numquam enim illae communitates adeo sunt sibi sufficientes sigillatim, quin indigeant aliquo mutuo iuvamine et societate, ac communicatione, interdum ad melius esse maioremque utilitatem, interdum vero etiam ob moralem necessitatem et indigentiam, ut ex ipso usu constat. Hac ergo ratione indigent aliquo iure, quo dirigantur et recte ordinentur in hoc genere communicationis et societatis.

41 Hugo Grotius, *Letter to Canon John Cordesius*, 15 October 1633. *Epistolae quotquot reperiri potuerant*, Amsterdam 1687, p. 118. Quoted by James St. Leger, *The 'Etiamsi daremus' of Hugo Grotius. A Study in the Origins of International Law*. Rome: Pontificium Athenaeum Internationale "Angelicum," 1962, p. 110.

Portugal, revolt or *Restauração*/Restoration, in 1640, against sixty years of Spanish rule. Francisco Velasco de Gouveia (c. 1580-1659)[42]

England, The Glorious Revolution of 1688 against the absolutist Stuart dynasty. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) and John Locke (1632-1704)

The United States of America, The American Revolution of 1776 against British colonial rule, proclaimed by the *Declaration of Independence* of Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), clearly inspired by Locke

France, The French Revolution of 1789, motivated by the *philosophes* and thinkers like Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1773) and Charles Montesquieu (1689-1755)

Latin America, beginning with the Mexican insurrection against Spanish rule in 1810, championed by Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla (1753-1811)[43]

The Portuguese and Latin American insurrections were directly inspired by Suárez; their leaders had formed their convictions by studying his writings. The impact of Suárez on England, America and France was more indirect, for his *Defensio* (a refutation of the absolutism of King James I) had been publicly burnt in England (1613)

42 FRANCISCO DE GOUVEIA, *Justa aclamação do Sereníssimo Rei de Portugal Dom João IV. Tratado analítico.* Lisbon: Lourenço de Anveres, 1644.

43 O. CARLOS STOETZER, *The Scholastic Roots of the Spanish American Revolution*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1979, p. 43: "In Spanish America sixteenth-century political ideas were very much alive in the seventeenth century in spite of the new emphasis on authority, resulting, no doubt, from the strong influence of Francisco Suárez. The impact of Suárez in Spanish America was not sporadic; it began gradually at the end of the sixteenth century and then increased, with the result that Suárez became the undisputed intellectual influence there during the late-sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, in spite of the occasional opposition of Thomism." And on p. 157: "The Scholastic influence is beyond any doubt operable during the Spanish and the Spanish American Wars of Independence, and represents a part of the Spanish liberal movement, which reached its summit in the Spanish Constitution of 1812, the common work of Spaniards and Spanish Americans.'

and France (1614), and it was unwise for any writer to refer to its author directly. However, there were hidden channels of Suarezian or like thought into England, France and the United States. One such channel was Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), transmitter to Protestant Europe of a version of the natural law developed by the Catholic Scholastics like Suárez—whom he greatly admired, and whose theory of international law he developed; Grotius was Locke's revered mentor in political philosophy.[44] Another channel was Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694), a jurist also indebted to Suárez and respected by Locke. If any Suarezian influence was transmitted to Locke, it was passed on by Locke to his devoted American follower Jefferson. However, the author of the American *Declaration to Independence* could also have been directly exposed to the thought of Suárez himself through a close associate, Charles Carroll (1737-1826),[45] the sole Catholic signatory to the *Declaration*, a lawyer who had been trained in Europe by Jesuit teachers familiar with the legal philosophy of Suárez. Locke also responded to jurists who refer to Suárez in their work, like the royalist Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and the anti-royalist Samuel Rutherford (1600-1661). Nowhere were the Jesuits more influential than in France, yet the protagonists of the French Enlightenment make hardly any reference to Suárez's work, though some of them, like Rousseau, use language that is a literal translation of some of his phrases.[46] The French theorists were aware of the polemicist Robert Bellarmine whose thought had affinities with that of Suárez. They were deeply affected by English political theory, which echoed Suarezian thinking, and were also familiar with Grotius and Pufendorf.

---

44 H. R. FOX BOURNE, *The Life of John Locke*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876. Vol. 2, p. 15: "At the university [of Leiden] founded only in 1575, but now nearly the most famous in Europe, Grotius, whom Locke looked upon as his foremost teacher in politics and all its philosophical and theological connections, had in 1594 begun to study under professors as learned as Joseph Scaliger."

45 Scott MCDERMOTT, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Faithful Revolutionary*. New York: Scepter Publishers Inc. 2002.

46 For example: Suárez: *homo nascitur liber* (*Defensio*, lib. 3, cap. 2, n. 9 [24: 209]); Jean-Jacques Rousseau: *L'homme est né libre* (*Du contrat social*, liv. 1, chap. 1); Suárez: *nullus habet iurisdictionem politicam in alium* (*De legibus*, lib. 3, cap. 2, n. 3 [5: 180]); Rousseau: *aucun homme n'a une autorité naturelle sur son semblable* (*op. cit.*, liv. 1, chap. 4).

The theories of all the democratically-minded philosophers mentioned above are too complex and nuanced to be fully treated here, but at the core of their theorizing there is a triadic pattern (clearly present in the speculation of Suárez and Locke) they all seem to agree on: 1. That political authority comes from the people, not from kings; 2. That this authority can, for reasons of just and efficient administration, be made over to a monarch (or oligarchs); and 3. That it can be withdrawn from the monarch in case he behaves tyrannically.

No statement emitted by the leaders of our five revolutions excels in eloquence the *Declaration of Independence*, which rightly claimed not to be original, but only to be "an expression of the American mind." It is indeed a fine synthesis of Lockian (and Suarezian) ideas, but in one point it departs from Locke and sides with Suárez. The natural rights claimed by tradition were life, liberty and property, subscribed to by Locke (and even by Carroll). Jefferson adds what we may call a Suarezian touch, when he substitutes "property" by "pursuit of happiness." According to Suárez, and all the other theologians he quotes, the right to happiness would be the supreme right and the synthesis of all the other rights. In the words of the Doctor of Coimbra: "I declare that, absolutely speaking, there is given an ultimate end, to and for which man has been ordained by the Author of nature. This conclusion is simply *de fide*…"[47]

The ultimate end for which man was created is happiness, so he must have the right to pursue it. This end, for believers, is God Himself. But what about unbelievers? (We have to accommodate them too.) Suárez has a description of happiness which would be acceptable to them also: "bliss can signify a certain happy state in which man will have the plenitude of good things and the complement of all his desires."[48] For unbelievers this could mean "external goods, goods of the body… goods of the soul." But for believers happiness would have a more spiritual meaning; it would be "the attainment of the ultimate

47 *De ultimo fine hominis*,, disp. 3, sect. 1, n. 1 [4: 26]: Dico … dari aliquem finem ultimum simpliciter, ad quem, et propter quem homo institutus est ab auctore naturae. Haec conclusio est simpliciter de fide…

48 *De ultimo fine hominis*,, disp. 4, sect. 1, n. 2 [4: 39]: beatitudo significare potest statum quemdam felicem, in quo habebit homo plenitudinem bonorum et complementum suorum desideriorum…

and supreme good that can be desired by man, in which all the rest are virtually contained, or which refer to it."[49]

So it could be argued that in referring to the right to the pursuit of happiness Jefferson is envisaging an organized society which has a supreme end, though differently interpreted by believers and unbelievers (perhaps hedonistically by some), but which is open to a spiritual interpretation and able to add a religious dimension to the life of the believers in that society.

49 *De ultimo fine hominis*,, disp. 4, sect. 1, n. 5 [4: 41]: consecutio ultimi ac supremi boni quod ab homine desiderare potest, et in quo cetera virtute continentur, seu ad illud referuntur.

CHAPTER 3
THE EXISTENTIAL INTEGRALISM OF SUÁREZ[1]

I. THE "GENERATION OF 80" & EXISTENTIALISM
1. The "Generation of 80"
2. Existentialism and Scholasticism: common themes
3. Existentialism and Scholasticism: differences
4. Existentialism,essentialism and modern philosophy

II. THE SCHOLASTIC EXISTENTIALISM OF SUÁREZ
1. Existential integralism
2. Preeminence of the singular

III. THE ALLEGED ESSENTIALISM OF SUÁREZ
1. Suárez's alleged essentialism
2. Terminology: Suarezian and Thomist

IV. SUAREZIAN BEING: UNITARY DYAD
1. The Suarezian equation of being with existence
2. The trichotomous being of Suárez
3. Aptitudinal or precisive existence
4. Interrelationship of concepts by composition or focusing
5. *Essentia realis*
6. Originality of Suárez's notion of being

V. PROOFS OF THE ALLEGED ESSENTIALISM OF SUÁREZ
1. Suárez portrayed as an existentialist
2. Suárez portrayed as an essentialist
3. Confusion of possible and aptitudinal existence
4. Irreducibility of Suarezian terminology

---

1 Article published in *Gregorianum* 85,4 (2004), pp. 660-688; some changes made here. An earlier version of the article, in Portuguese, entitled "O integralismo existencial de Suárez. In calumniatorem Doctoris Eximii," was published in *Revista filosófica de Coimbra*, 7-14 (Outubro 98) pp. 295-312.

SEQUEL: THE ANAMORPHOSIS OF SUÁREZ
1. Representationalists on the unitary dyad
2. Representationalists on aptitudinal existence
3. Representationalists on analogy
4. Representationalists on the double concept

existentia, ut existentia,
correspondet enti ut sic,
estque de intrinseca ratione eius,
vel in potentia, vel in actu,
prout sumptum fuerit ens.

Suárez, *Disputationes Metaphysicae* 50: 12: 15

Our brief survey of the Uncommon Doctor's moral philosophy completed, we can now concentrate on his metaphysics, starting with a scrutiny of its foundation, the doctrine of the preeminence of existence over essence, an insight that generated the consummate Scholastic system and also its anamorphosis from which modern philosophy evolved. The Doctor's insight into the preeminence of existence seems to have escaped the attention of the Suarezians of the 19th century, conditioned as they were by the essentialist philosophies of Descartes and his rationalist successors. The reactivation of that insight is to be owed to a mid-20th century philosophical movement which also proclaimed the primacy of existence, but of an existence that (unlike the Scholastic) was viewed as the antithesis and not the complement of essence.

I. THE "GENERATION OF 80" & EXISTENTIALISM

1. The "Generation of 80"

Inspired by the thought of the religious philosopher Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1855), a group of men, born for the most part in the eighth decade of the 19th century, espoused, around the time of the Second World War, an intellectual movement that came to be known as "existentialism." According to the presuppositions held in common by these thinkers, the human being is a uniquely existent individual, endowed with liberty, and confronted in his lifetime with the choice of

concrete possibilities, which can be authentically or inauthentically realized. Among these thinkers, who are classified—sometimes contrary to their will—as "existentialists," are Karl jaspers (1883-1969), José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955), Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), Paul Tillich (1886-1965), Karl Barth (1886-1968), Gabriel Marcel (1887-1973) and Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), the latter identifiable as existentialism's high priest, even though he himself would have rejected the classification.

2. Existentialism & Scholasticism: common themes

Metaphysically, the central theme of the movement was the transitory and contingent character of human existence, a consciousness of the fact that any particular existent human being could never have existed at all. These concepts found resonance in Scholastic thought, in that of Suárez not least. Speaking of the creature, the *Doctor Eximius* declares that existence belongs to it

> contingently or not from necessity, since and before it came to be, it did not have it, and, after it has had it, can be deprived of it. But these are the conditions of existence (*conditiones existentiae*), because of which it is believed most of all to be distinguished from essence, for essence is said not to pertain to a thing contingently, but in a manner that is necessary and inseparable.[2]

Besides its preoccupation with the "conditions of existence" (*conditiones existentiae*)—and with their apparent incompatibility with the eternity of essences—the new movement was interested, in particular, with the freedom of the human will, as a faculty capable of various actions, none of which it felt itself compelled to exercise, even when it was in possession of all the conditions indispensable to realize those actions. It was a question of a cause (the human will) whose knowledge of its capacity (to exercise various actions) did not permit anyone to predict which particular action that cause would exercise at a given moment in time. The determination to perform a particular action without any compulsion to do so is known as "choice": of all things affected by the *conditiones existentiae* the most contingent and "existential" are choices.

2 *DM* 31: 4: 5 [26: 236]: contingenter seu non necessario, quandoquidem et priusquam fieret, illud non habuit, et potest, posteaquam illud habet, illo privari; sed istae sunt conditiones existentiae, propter quas maxime censetur distingui ab essentia; nam essentia dicitur non convenire rei contingenter, sed necessario et inseparabiliter.

The determination and actualization of particular choices can only be known in the contingent moment of that determination, "by intuiting the actual existences of singular things for their particular times" (*intuendo actuales existentias singularium rerum pro suis temporibus*).[3] God Himself cannot know these determinations through "seeing the effect in the sole power of the cause, but" only through "seeing its actual emanation from its cause" ([*non*] *videndo effectum in sola virtute causae, sed videndo emanationem a sua causa*).[4]

3. Existentialism and Scholasticism: differences

In this way both existentialism and Scholasticism were in agreement about the philosophical importance of existence. But the existentialists had difficulty in reconciling the contingency and temporality of existences with the postulated eternity and immutability of essences, and so were inclined to diminish the importance of essence in their philosophical reflections, and to affirm the primacy (or precedence) of existence over essence. On the contrary, the Scholastics never excluded essence from their speculations; in fact, the study of essences occupies most of Scholastic philosophy in its various branches, such as metaphysics, cosmology, psychology and ethics.

4. Existentialism, essentialism & modern philosophy

Before we proceed to analyze the Scholastic existentialism of Suárez, it is pertinent to raise the question whether the contrasted categories of existentialism and essentialism can be of use in differentiating the two universes of Scholasticism and modern philosophy. Can we hypothesize (as has been suggested).[5] that what unifies modern philosophy, at least in its Cartesian form (as opposed to Scholasticism) is essentialism, and what unifies Scholasticism, at least in its Baroque (or Late) Scholastic form (as opposed to modern philosophy), is its existentialism? (Pedro da Fonseca, 1528-1599, typifies existentialism

3 *Opusculum 2, De scientia Dei futurorum contingentium*, lib. 1, cap. 8, n. 12 [11: 330].

4 *Opusculum* 2, lib. 1, cap. 8, n. 12 [11: 331].

5 Cf. Jorge Secada *Cartesian Metaphysics. The Late Scholastic Origins of Modern Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, 2000. Chapter 1. Descartes's essentialist metaphysics.

when he states that "first we show that a thing exists, next what it is."[6] Descartes, for his part, represents essentialism when he declares that "according to the rules of true logic we must never ask whether something exists [*an est*] unless we already know what it is [*quid est*]."[7])

It would appear not to be so, for the simple reason that not all modern philosophies (particularly modern existentialism!) are essentialist, and not all Scholastic philosophies (like Cajetanian Thomism, according to Gilson) are existentialist, as we shall have occasion in our present discussion to ascertain.

II. THE SCHOLASTIC EXISTENTIALISM OF SUÁREZ

1. Existential integralism

Preeminent among the Scholastics who centered their thought on existence is the Uncommon Doctor. In fact it is possible that, in the entire history of philosophy, there may not be a statement so categorically existential as that of the same Doctor, which follows, and which was exhibited at the beginning of this essay, a statement that identifies being with existence itself:

> existentia, ut existentia, correspondet enti ut sic, estque de intrinseca ratione eius, vel in potentia, vel in actu, prout sumptum fuerit ens.[8]

But it is not an existence devoid of essence. (Hence Suarezianism cannot be identified with existentialism, in the sense of being a philosophy exclusive of essence; it is better described as "existential integralism," that is to say, an existentialism inclusive of essence, where essence and existence form an integral whole.)[9] Essence and existence constitute one of the dualities with which the human mind understands reality. Suárez, as we noted in the last chapter, often treats of the members of these dualities as complementary, with one of the members enjoying

---

6 Pedro da Fonseca, *Principles of Logic*. Quoted by Secada in *Cartesian Metaphysics*, p. 8.

7 Descartes, *Meditations*, quoted by Secada in *Cartesian Metaphysics*, p. 7.

8 *DM* 50: 12: 15 [26: 969].

9 *DM* 31: 6: 23 [26: 250]: eamdem rem esse essentiam et existentiam.

the preeminence. Thus, essence and existence complement each other, but existence has the preeminence.

Because if according to reason or the precision of the mind the two are compared, existence is to be preferred to essence, because, with existence prescinded, essence is not understood to survive in actuality, but only in potency, and because nothing is perfect in actuality unless it actually exists: hence existence itself is said to be the perfection of perfections and the greatest of all perfections... Wherefore, if the comparison be made between existence precisely conceived as a mode [of essence], and the essence as actually existent, then essence is conceived as something more perfect, because it is conceived as something which is, or as including all the perfection of both essence and existence.[10]

Existence (as we have noted) is always singular.

It must be said, absolutely speaking, that existence properly and immediately only belongs to singular things... because no being can actually exist unless it be individual and singular, and existence in reality is nothing but the very actual entity of the individual thing.[11]

2. Preeminence of the singular

Opposed to the singular is the universal, with both singular and universal constituting another of the dualities that for Suárez exemplify complementarity-with-preeminence. In this case the preeminence (given Suárez's emphasis on the primacy of existence), rests with the singular. This is because

> the intellect knows the singular by forming its proper and distinct concept... Our intellect knows the singular material [entity] by its

10 *DM* 31: 13: 23 [26: 306]: Quod si secundum rationem aut praecisionem mentis illa duo comparentur, praefertur existentia essentiae, quia praecisa existentia non intelligitur manere essentia in actu, sed potentia tantum, et quia nihil est actu perfectum, nisi quod actu est, ideo dicitur ipsum esse perfectio perfectionum omnium, et maxima omnium perfectionum... Quapropter, si comparatio fiat inter existentiam praecise conceptam ut modum, et essentiam ut actu existentem, sic essentia concipitur ut quid perfectius, quia concipitur ut id quod est, seu ut includens totam perfectionem essentiae et existentiae.

11 *DM* 31: 11: 4 [26: 272]: simpliciter dicendum est, existentiam proprie et immediate solum esse rerum singularium... quia nullum ens actu esse potest, nisi individuum et singulare; existentia autem in re nihil aliud est quam ipsamet actualis entitas rei individuae.

proper representation... Our intellect directly knows singular material things without reflection.[12]

III. THE ALLEGED ESSENTIALISM OF SUÁREZ

1. Suárez's alleged essentialism

Around 1940 historians started to become aware of the affinities between Scholasticism and existentialism, and to speculate whether any of the philosophical tendencies of the School could be identified as "existentialist." Conspicuous among these historians—one belonging to the "generation of 80"—was Étienne Gilson (1884-1978). In 1948, the year which marked the fourth centenary of the Uncommon Doctor's birth, there appeared our French Thomist's notable book, *L'être et l'essence*[13] ("Being and Essence," henceforth *Être*), which perhaps is "the most brilliant apology for the philosophy of Aquinas in the framework of a historical interpretation."[14] A year later, the Toronto professor published a somewhat more elaborate version of the book, in English, entitled *Being and Some Philosophers* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1949. Henceforth, *Being*). Both these books present an almost paradigmatic expression of the Thomist conviction that philosophy, from the time of the ancient Greeks, evolved, with some reverses, slowly, until it reached its apogee in Aquinas; but after him was in a continuous process of degradation. Given the excellence of his work, the Common Doctor—in the words of Pope Leo XIII—"appears to have left his successors the faculty of imitating, but to have deprived them of the capacity of excelling [him]."[15] For Gilson Thomas was the supreme, if not the only, Scholastic existentialist, the discoverer of the true meaning of existence, "this sublime truth," *hanc sublimem veritatem*. Unfortunately, after the demise of the great

12 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 3, nn. 3, 5, 7 [3: 722-724]: intellectus cognoscit singulare formando proprium et distinctum conceptum illius... Intellectus noster cognoscit singulare materiale per propriam ipsius speciem... Intellectus noster cognoscit directe singularia materialia absque reflectione.

13 Etienne Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*. Paris : J. Vrin, 1948.

14 António Manuel Martins, *Lógica e ontologia em Pedro da Fonseca*. Lisbon: Fundação Gulbenkian & JNICT, 1990, p. 196.

15 Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris. Acta Sanctae Sedis*, vol. 12 (1879), p. 109: facultatem imitandi posteris reliquisse, superandi potestatem ademisse videtur.

Doctor, his discovery was almost forgotten. "In drawing up the balance sheet of Scholastic metaphysics," notes the French Thomist sadly, "one should never forget that Christian philosophers have not been able to entrust to their modern successors with the greatest metaphysical discovery which any of them made."[16]

For our professor of the Collège de France, among the successors of the Master who were insensible to this sublime discovery, and who continued stubborn in their adhesion to the antiquated essentialism, figures Suárez. In classifying the Uncommon Doctor's system, Gilson has no doubts that he has reached the very core of its thought: "we attempt," declares the professor,

> to extricate from his text the intuition of primeval being, simple and anterior to all controversy, which governs all his argumentation, and it seems to us that one can summarize without inexactitude what he is thinking, in saying that, for Suárez, the notion of essence is adequate to the notion of being, so well that one can express all that is being in terms of essence, with the certitude that nothing will be lost.[17]

2. Terminology: Suarezian and Thomist

Now, given the clarity with which Suárez proclaims his existentialist convictions—a clarity that our detailed analysis will make more vivid—how could our medievalist have metamorphosed the Uncommon Doctor into an essentialist? Perhaps for the four following reasons.

First, an *unreflective reading of the text of Suárez*. Given his preoccupation with treating each theme in an encyclopedic manner, Suárez writes in a voluminous fashion, exciting impatience even in his sympathetic readers, causing them to rush through a complexly configured text and lose the nuances of its thought.

Second, a *Thomist reading of Suarezian terminology*; due to the French medievalist's evident conviction that Thomism is normative of all Scholastic thought. But Thomism is only one variety of Scholasticism, and the Suarezian system is irreducible to it to the extent that even their technical languages remain impervious to each other.

---

16 Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers,* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1949, p. 118.

17 Gilson, *Être*, pp. 147-148.

Third, a *general antipathy toward Suárez, shared by the majority of Thomists*, which is understandable, given that the Uncommon Doctor is their system's major critic. When Gilson speaks of Suárez, he treats him with a severity that he spares some other philosophers who are even more refractory to the Thomist doctrines, such as Descartes, Spinoza, Wolff and Kant. The following quote exemplifies Gilson's patronizing attitude toward the critic of Thomism:

> Rather than judge, Suárez arbitrates, with the consequence that he never wanders very far from the truth and frequently hits upon it, but, out of pure moderation of mind, sometimes contents himself with a "near miss".[18] Obviously, Suárez is not existence-blind. He knows that real things do exist; what he does not know is where existence can fit in such a philosophical interpretation as his own is...[19] This is why Suárez does not know existence when he sees it.[20]

Fourth, an *enhancement of the drama of the situation*, where a great discovery is made and rejected, requiring the use of the novelistic cliché of hero and villain, the hero being the Common Doctor, the genial protagonist of existentialism, and the villain the Uncommon Doctor, the stubborn promoter of essentialism. For the latter

> has become responsible for the spreading of a metaphysics of essences which makes profession of disregarding existences as irrelevant to its own object. This is the more remarkable as, after all, Suárez himself had never discarded existences as irrelevant to metaphysical speculation; but he had identified existences with actual essences, so that his disciples were quite excusable in ruling existence out of metaphysics.[21]

If the diminutive Andalusian priest had not appeared on the scene, who knows? Perhaps the existential bellow of the Dumb Sicilian Ox would have echoed throughout the world (of Western philosophy)!

---

18 Gilson, *Being*, p. 99.

19 Gilson, *Being*, pp. 101-102.

20 Gilson, *Being*, p. 105.

21 *Ibid*.

IV. SUAREZIAN BEING: UNITARY DYAD

1. The Suarezian equation of being with existence

Part of this essay is based on the brilliant reply to *Être et essence* by José Hellin (1883-1973)—the greatest Suarezian of our time and himself belonging to the "generation of 80"!—a reply titled "Existencialismo escolastico suareciano," published in the review *Pensamiento* of 1956 and 1957.[22]

Any discussion on being, according to Suárez, must begin with the clarification of its concept, "at least by some sort of description, or by an explanation of terms, for since that notion is most abstract and most simple, it cannot be properly defined" (*saltem per descriptionem aliquam, aut terminorum explicationem; nam cum illa ratio sit abstractissima et simplicissima, proprie definiri non potest*).[23]

To determine the Uncommon Doctor's ideas on being, we will divide our analysis of the relevant material in four parts: the Suarezian equation of being and existence; the trichotomous notion of Suarezian being; the distinctive Suarezian concept of *essentia realis*; and Gilson's proofs of the supposed essentialism of Suárez.

In the first place, the Suarezian equation of being (*ens*, *esse*) and existence (*existentia*) is clear not only in the text cited at the beginning of this essay (*existentia ut existentia correspondet enti ut sic*), but in innumerable other texts, of which we can quote the following:

> "being and existence are the same" (*esse enim et existere idem sunt*).[24]

> "being as being is described by existence, and has the significance of being either through existence, or by reference to existence" (*ens in quantum ens ab esse dictum est, et per esse vel per ordinem ad esse habet rationem entis*).[25]

---

22 José Hellín, "Existencialismo escolastico suareciano," *Pensamiento,* 1956 (vol. 12, pp. 157-178) and 1957 (vol. 13, pp. 21-38). Among Gilson's other critics we must include M. Schneider, "Der angebliche Essentialismus des Suárez," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 24 (1961), pp. 40-68.

23 *DM* 2: 4: 1 [25: 87-88].

24 *DM loc. cit.* [25: 88].

25 *DM* 31: 1: 1 [26: 224].

> "every real entity is constituted in some real existence, since being is described through existence, and real being by real existence..." (*omnis entitas realis constituitur aliquo esse reali, cum ens ab esse dicatur, et ens reale ab esse reali*).[26]

> "existence is coterminous with being, since being is described through existence; hence, just as being does not belong to any particular genus, but transcends all the predicaments, so too does existence" (*esse aeque patet ac ipsum ens, cum ens ab esse dictum sit; unde, sicut ens non pertinet ad certum genus, sed transcendit omnia praedicamenta, ita et esse ...*).[27]

> "[the act of existing] is so to speak formal in the concept of being" ([*actus essendi*] *est veluti formale in conceptu entis*).[28]

2. The trichotomous being of Suárez

For the Uncommon Doctor, the notion of being has a triple or trichotomous sense—actual, aptitudinal and potential.

> 1. *Actual existence*. Being as a participle or participially considered (*ens ut participium vel participialiter sumptum*): it signifies "the act of existing, as exercised, and is the same as existent in actuality" (*actum essendi, ut exercitum, estque idem quod existens actu*).[29]

> 2. *Aptitudinal or precisive existence*. Being as a noun or nominally considered (*ens ut nomen vel nominaliter sumptum*): it signifies, "in a formal sense, the essence of a thing, which has or can have existence, and can be said to signify existence itself, not as actually exercised, but in potency or aptitude" ([*significat*] *de formali essentiam eius rei, quae habet vel potest habere esse, et potest dici significare ipsum esse, non ut exercitum actu, sed in potentia vel aptitudine*).[30] The Suarezian term for aptitudinal existence (or existence as intelligible) is *essentia realis*.

(Here Suárez is introducing a new idea, that of existence as abstracting both from its actual exercise and from the absence or negation of

26 *DM* 31: 4: 2 [26: 235].

27 *DM* 31: 7: 2 [26: 251].

28 *DM* 2: 2: 14 [25: 75].

29 *DM* 2: 4: 3 [25: 88].

30 *Ibid*. [25: 88].

that exercise: in other words, as abstracting from both actual and potential existence. He settles on a new word, "aptitudinal" existence, but unfortunately lumps it with potential existence—*potentia vel aptitudine*—creating the mistaken impression, which he later corrects, that the negative potential existence and the precisive aptitudinal existence are identical in meaning. The only justification for lumping them together is that they both signify an existence not actually exercised.)

> 3. *Possible existence*, which also signifies "real being, in so far as it has real essence, contracted and determined not by anything positive, but by the privation of actual existence" (*reale ens, quantum ad realem essentiam, contractum et determinatum non per aliquod positivum, sed per privationem actualis existentiae*).[31]

Of these three concepts, only the first two (the actual or participial and the aptitudinal or nominal) are immediately signified by the incomplex term "being"; thus Suarezian being is at the same time unitary and dichotomous, a "unitary dyad" or "dyadic unity", so to speak. The third concept, which makes the dichotomy a Trichotomy, is a complex one (compounded of two concepts, existence + negation of actual exercise), described by such composite ideas as "possible being," or "being in potency."

The distinction between the nominal and the participial was widespread in Suárez's time, but it occurs in writers like Cajetan (1469-1534), Sylvester of Ferrara (1474-1528) and Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599). There was general agreement that nominal being signified essence or nature, and participial being, existence. Sylvester's view was a little more complex. Both the nominal and the participial signified essence and existence; the nominal signified essence primarily and existence secondarily, and the participial signified existence primarily and essence (presumably) secondarily. There was disagreement about where the ten predicaments belonged; Cajetan assigned them to participial being, but some of Cajetan's contemporaries and Sylvester relegated them to nominal being. Suárez revised the notions of nominal and participial being significantly. He showed no interest in the predicaments, or with essence. He classed both notions under the rubric of existence (as Sylvester had done somewhat differently), but added the concept of potential existence. In this way, the entire universe of existence was included. Suárez further reduced nominal

31 *DM* 2: 4: 12 [25: 91].

and participial to a single concept, in two degrees of abstraction, turning it into a unitary dyad.[32]

3. Aptitudinal or precisive existence

The idea of "aptitudinal or precisive existence" (or *essentia realis*) seems to be original in Suárez, and will be explained in more detail presently. Before that, we must examine how it is related to the idea of actually exercised existence: in other words, how the two incomplex notions of being are connected among themselves. As we observed, Suárez thinks that they are one unique concept in two degrees of abstraction (what we have termed a unitary dyad). Notes the Uncommon Doctor:

> Therefore, in this manner, "being" does not signify any concept common to being nominally or participially considered, but immediately has a double meaning, by which it signifies either being as prescinding from actual existence [= aptitudinal or precisive existence] or being as actually existent [= actual existence]... For "being" primarily seems to signify a thing having a real and actual existence, as a participle of the verb "to be"; thence that word was in fact transferred to signify precisely that which has a real essence [= aptitudinal existence].[33]

(In addition to being a unitary dyad, simultaneously unitary and dichotomous, the concept of being is another example of the complementarity-with-preeminence duality: actual and aptitudinal existence are complementary, but the actual has the preeminence.)

---

32 Material taken from Jean-François Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, Épiméthée, 1990, pp. 228-245.

33 *DM* 2: 4: 9 [25: 90]: Ita ergo ens non significat conceptum aliquem communem enti nominaliter et participialiter sumpto, sed immediate habet duplicem significationem, qua significat, vel ens praescindendo ab actuali existentia, vel ens actu existens... Primo enim ens significasse videtur rem habentem esse reale et actuale, tanquam participium verbi essendi; inde vero translata est illa vox ad praecise significandum id quod habet essentiam realem.

4. Interrelationship of concepts by composition or focusing

Concepts come to be mutually related in two ways: by composition or by conceptual focusing. The second way, original to Suárez, is described as contraction by a more express concept, or by a greater expression (*contractio per expressiorem conceptum, vel per maiorem expressionem*). The conceptual focusing resolves the problem of the One and the Many in a wholly original way.

Interrelation of concepts by *composition* refers to *generic and specific concepts* that are not mutually inclusive, and where the genus ("animal") is combined with a species ("rational") to constitute a composite ("man")—the latter, in its turn, is resoluble into its components (rational + animal). Here the broader category ("animal") does not include its particulars ("rational," "irrational") in its meaning.

Interrelation of concepts by *conceptual focusing* refers to *transcendental concepts*, in which the broader category (for instance, "heat") includes all its particulars ("eight degrees" etc. of heat). As Suárez says:

> the common concept of heat is not only included in the [concept of the] total heat as having eight degrees, but also in its [other] particular degrees. When mention is made of "eight degrees of heat," a distinct mode is not added, forming a composition with "heat as such"; but we conceive and signify "heat" in a more express manner, as it is in itself.[34]

We can take another example, which is not that of Suárez, but of modern optics, which will perhaps further clarify the notion of conceptual focusing: the general notion of "color," which at the same time both unites and differentiates the particular notions of "blue," "yellow" and "red." The differentiation between the general and the particular is situated in the degree of focusing. When we consider "blue" and "yellow" as just "color," they signify, *confusedly*, what they have in common: that is to say, the quality of an object in relation to the light reflected in the various wave lengths of that object. Taken as particular colors, they refer, *expressly*, to the particular wavelengths that differentiate the ef-

34 *DM* 2: 6: 9 [25: 101]: conceptus communis caloris non solum includitur in toto calore ut octo, sed etiam in singulis gradibus eius; cum ergo dicitur calor ut octo, non additur modus distinctus faciens compositionem cum calore ut sic, sed exprimitur et concipitur calor, prout est in se.

fects of light, which are "blue" (450-500 nm. or nanometers), "yellow" (570-590 nm.) and "red" (610-780 nm.).

When we compare the general and the particular in transcendental concepts, we see that they are not resolvable into two concepts that are not inclusive. "Red" cannot be resolved into "color" and "red," since "red" is also "color." What distinguishes the general from the particular in transcendental concepts can be described as follows:

The *general concept* is more abstract, aptitudinal and confusive, less distinctly focused, based on the knowledge "through which an object is considered not distinctly and determinately as it is in reality, but according to some similitude or conformity it has with other things" (*qua consideratur obiectum, non distincte et determinate prout est in re, sed secundum aliquam similitudinem, vel convenientiam quam cum aliis habet*).[35] The *particular concept* is the same general concept more determinate and express, or more distinctly focused, "because all that is confusedly considered in the precise concept, is found in the other object more expressly conceived, and in all that object, in whatever way it is considered" (*quia totum id, quod confuse concipitur in illo conceptu praeciso, reperitur in alio obiecto expressius concepto, et in toto illo, quacumque ratione consideretur*).[36] In other words, "the thing is conceived according to the determinate mode in which it exists in fact" (*concipitur res secundum determinatum modum quo est in re*).[37]

Let us return to the nominal and participial connotations of the unitary dyad "being." As we remarked, for the Uncommon Doctor, "that double acceptance does not signify a double connotation of being dividing any common meaning, or common concept, but signifies a concept of being more or less precise" (*illam duplicem acceptionem non significare duplicem rationem entis dividentem aliquam communem rationem, seu conceptum communem, sed significare conceptum entis magis vel minus praecisum*);[38] the more precise concept referring to being nominally considered (= aptitudinal or precisive existence), and the less precise and more express concept to being participially considered (= actual existence).

35 *DM* 2: 6: 10 [25: 101].

36 *DM* 2: 6: 7 [25: 101].

37 *Ibid*. [25: 101].

38 *DM* 2: 4: 9 [25: 90].

Of the members of the Trichotomy, the first and the third, that is, actual or possible existence, need no explanation. It is the second member, aptitudinal existence, which requires to be clarified, as it caused problems for Gilson and his successors. Suárez warns us of its erroneous interpretation, which confuses it with possible existence—an interpretation that has had unfortunate consequences in later philosophical development. Aptitudinal or precisive existence is existence considered in its intelligible content, and not in its actual exercise, "prescinding from actual existence, and not however excluding it, or negating it, but only precisively abstracting from it" (*praescindendo ab actuali existentia, non quidem excludendo illam, seu negando, sed praecisive tantum abstrahendo*).[39] It is thus clearly differentiated from possible existence. In the words of Suárez, the term aptitudinal existence, or being nominally considered,

> does not signify being in potency, in so far as it is privatively or negatively opposed to being in act, but only signifies being in so far as it precisely denotes a real essence, which is a very different matter. For just as precisive abstraction is different from the negative, thus being nominally considered, although it precisely signifies being having a real essence, does not indeed add a negation, that is, of lacking actual existence, which negation or privation being in potency adds.

The proof of the difference between these two senses of existence—aptitudinal and possible—is conclusive,

> for being nominally considered [or aptitudinal existence] is common to God and the creatures, and can be truly affirmed of God; but being in potency can in no way be predicated of God; indeed, neither can it be of actually existing creatures as such, for they are not then in potency, but in act. Nevertheless, being can be affirmed of them, both as participle and as noun, for though they possess actual existence, it can be truly be said of them that they possess real essence [or aptitudinal existence], prescinding from, and not negating, actual existence.[40]

39 *Ibid*. [25: 90].

40 *DM* 2: 4: 11 [25: 91]: Quod inde etiam manifeste patet, nam ens in vi nominis sumptum commune est Deo et creaturis, et de Deo affirmari vere potest; ens autem in potentia nullo modo potest praedicari de Deo; imo nec de creaturis existentibus ut sic proprie dicitur, quia iam non sunt in potentia, sed in actu; cum tamen de illis dici potest ens, tam ut participium quam

And while we are on the topic of aptitudinal existence, it is pertinent to note that the Thomists evidently accept a version of it too, though apparently just in the context of the Anselmian version of the ontological argument. The point of the argument is that the concept of God is that of a supremely perfect being, and there can be no perfection without the greatest of perfections, existence. Existence therefore, the argument concludes, has to be affirmed of God.

In response Cajetan[41] observes that existence can be thought of as "signified" (*existentia ut significata*), or belonging to the "order of representation"; and as "exercised" (*existentia ut exercita*), as belonging to the "order of exercise". As signifed it is looked at solely as an object of thought, or of representation, as a mode of intelligible nature, as an idea, as no more than an object of a simple intellectual *apprehension*. As "exercised" it is referred to as detained (so to speak) by a subject, as effected in extra-mental reality, as attributed in a *judgment*. Hence, when we attribute existence to the idea of the perfect being in the ontological argument, we attribute it only as signified (through an act of apprehension), but not as exercised (in an act of judgment). In the latter case nothing is added to the intelligible objective content of existence as signified, but only its effectuation *extra causas*. Cajetan notes that it is by nouns or ideas that things are conceived as signified, and by verbs as exercised or effected. He concludes that the ontological argument is fallacious because *a significari et cogitari ad esse non valet argumentum*. Here the Thomist "existence as signified" seems to correspond to the Suarezian "aptitudinal existence."[42]

---

ut nomen, quia licet habeant actualem existentiam, vere de illis dicitur quod habent essentiam realem, praescindendo, et non negando, actualem existentiam.

41 Cajetan, Commentary on Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 2, art. 1, ad 2.

42 Maritain, summarizes the Thomist understanding of aptitudinal existence in the following work, *Distinguish to Unite or The Degrees of Knowledge*. Translated from the fourth French Edition… University of Notre Dame Press, 1995, p. 104: "Through simple apprehension, existence is grasped and presented to the mind not insofar as a subject has it or can have it (*existentia ut exercita*), but rather insofar as it can be conceived *per modum quidditatis*, as constituting a certain intelligible object, a certain quiddity (*existentia ut significata*). It is only in the mind's second operation (composition and division) and in the judgment, that existence is known *ut exercita*, as possessed. Remember, the judgment does not rest content with a representation or ap-

5. *Essentia realis*

Essentia realis is the Suarezian term for precisive or aptitudinal existence. All its significance is referential to existence. As the Uncommon Doctor states,

> What the real essence or quiddity in fact is, cannot be understood without reference to existence or to real actual entity; we do not otherwise understand any essence, which does not exist in actuality, to be real, unless because it is of such a kind that being a real entity is not repugnant to it, an entity that it possesses through actual existence. For though actual existence is not of the creature's essence, however, reference to existence, or the aptitude to exist, belongs to its intrinsic and essential concept; and in this way being is an essential predicate.[43]

Essentia realis is a term of some complexity. Attention to its careful analysis by Suárez will help avoid some of Gilson's mistakes. The following is a synopis of its divisions:

REAL ESSENCE IN SO FAR AS IT IS ESSENCE
  In relation to the effects or attributes of a thing
  In relation to our manner of thinking and feeling
REAL ESSENCE IN SO FAR AS IT IS REAL
  Negative sense
  Affirmative sense
    A posteriori
    A priori: explicable by exterior or interior causes

To begin with, real essence can be considered either in so far as it is essence or in so far as it is real.

---

prehension of existence; it affirms it; it projects into it, as effected or able to be effected outside the mind, objects of concepts that have been apprehended by the mind. In other words, when the intellect judges, it sees in an intentional manner and through an act proper to it the very act of existing that the thing exercises or can exercise outside the mind."

43 *DM* 2: 2: 14 [25: 92]: Quod vero essentia aut quidditas realis sit, intelligi non potest sine ordine ad esse et realem entitatem actualem; non enim aliter concipimus essentiam aliquam, quae actu non existit, esse realem, nisi quia talis est, ut ei non repugnet esse entitatem actualem, quod habet per actualem existentiam; quamvis ergo actu esse non sit de essentia creaturae, tamen ordo ad esse, vel aptitudo essendi est de intrinseco et essentiali conceptu eius; atque hoc modo ens praedicatum est essentiale.

Essence, *in so far as it is essence*, has two senses: in relation to the effects or attributes of a thing, or in relation to our manner of thinking and feeling. In the first sense, real essence is "that which is the first, radical or intimate principle of all actions and properties which belong to a thing, and in this sense, it is said to be the nature of any particular thing" (*id, quod est primum et radicale, ac intimum principium omnium actionum et proprietatum, quae rei conveniunt, et sub hac ratione dicitur natura uniuscuiusque rei*).[44] In the second sense, essence is

> what is explained by a definition...that which is first conceived of a thing, first (I say), not in the order of origin... but in the order rather of nobility and the firstness of the object. For that refers to the essence of a thing, which we first conceive as pertaining to that thing, and to first constitute it intrinsically in the existence of a thing, or of such a thing. In this way essence is even described as "quiddity" [or "whatness"] with reference to our manner of speaking, because it is that by which we respond to the question, "what" a thing is.[45]

Alternately, essence may be described as "that by which an act of existence is first understood in anything" (*id, quod per actum essendi primo esse intelligitur in unaquaque re*).[46]

Essence, *in so far as it is real*, has two senses, negative and affirmative. In the *negative* sense essence is real, because "it involves in itself no contradiction, nor is it merely fabricated by the intellect" (*in sese nullam involvit repugnantiam, neque est mere conficta per intellectum*).[47]

In the *affirmative* sense, real essence still has two senses, a posteriori and a priori. In the *a posteriori* sense, real essence is "the principle or root of operations or effects, whether in the genus of efficient, formal, or material cause; thus there is no essence that cannot have any effect or real property" (*principium vel radix realium operationum, vel effectuum, sive sit in genere causae efficientis, sive formalis, sive materialis ; sic*

---

44 *DM* 2: 4: 6 [25: 89].

45 *Ibid*. [25: 89]: quae per definitionem explicatur... [id] quod primo concipitur de re; primo (inquam) non ordine originis... sed ordine nobilitatis potius et primitatis obiecti; nam id est de essentia rei, quod concipimus primo illi convenire, et primo constitui intrinsece in esse rei, vel talis rei, et hoc modo etiam vocatur essentia quidditas in ordine ad locutiones nostras, quia est id, per quod respondemus ad quaestionem, quid sit res.

46 *Ibid*. [25: 89].

47 *DM* 2: 4: 7 [25: 89].

enim nulla est essentia quae non possit habere aliquem effectum vel proprietatem realem).[48]

In the *a priori* sense a real essence, again, has two senses, explicable by extrinsic or intrinsic causes. The *extrinsic* cause of real essence is "that which can be really produced by God, and constituted in the being of an actual entity." But in so far as concerns an *intrinsic* cause, real essence has none, because it is itself "the first cause or intrinsic reason of being, as well as the most simple, so that it is conceived by this most common concept of essence. Whence we can only say that real essence is that which of itself has the aptitude to be, or to exist in reality" (*est prima causa vel ratio intrinseca entis, et simplicissima, ut hoc communissimo conceptu essentiae concipitur; unde solum dicere possumus, essentiam realem eam esse quae ex se apta est esse, seu realiter existere*).[49]

6. Originality of Suárez's notion of being

Before we examine what are offered as proofs of the Uncommon Doctor's alleged essentialism, it will be appropriate to discuss summarily the originality of his notion of being. This originality will be highlighted by a comparison with the Thomist views on the same topic. Both these positions, the Suarezian and the Thomist can be presented as four dualities, congruent in Suarezianism and incongruent in Thomism. The four dualities are as follows (the Thomist in parentheses):

1. The identity of being and existence (vs. distinction between essence and existence)
2. The unitary dyadic character of being (vs. dual being, common and absolute)
3. The method of conceptual focusing to relate the different levels of being (vs. differentiation of being through relative nonbeing)
4. The combination of the unitary being with the multiform analogy (vs. the combination of multiple being with multiform analogy).

1. The basis of Suárez's metaphysics is the identity of being with existence, a duality whose members, essence and existence, are congruent, indeed, identical. For essence is what constitutes a thing intrinsically in its existence; it is that by which an act of existence is first

48 *Ibid*. [25: 89].

49 *Ibid*. [25: 89-90].

understood in anything. Aquinas, for his part also has a duality of existence and essence; but it is incongruent and contrastive, as existence represents perfection and essence a limitation of perfection.

2. The existential being of Suárez is a unitary dyad. It has a unity, but immanent in this unity is a duality whose members, nominal and the participial being, are complementary and not contrastive. (The difference between them is that the same concept, focused broadly, is nominal being, and focused more narrowly, is participial being.) Thomism too has a duality here, of two contrastive categories of being: absolute being, which is assigned to God, and common being (*ens commune*), to the creature. However, concepts derived from common being (like cause, existence, essence, for instance) are liberally made use of in discourse on absolute being, so that there is ambiguity as to whether the being of God is to be classified under common being or absolute being.

3. The practice of conceptual focusing enables Suárez to offer a new solution to the problem of the One and the Many. The problem is how to reconcile the undivided unity that all entities have in the concept of being (viewed by Parmenides, c. 450 BC, as a monist substance) with the differences of individual beings that experience shows are divided from one another. Being cannot be divided from itself by itself, but only by something that is different from itself. This different something is for Thomists not absolute nonbeing or nothingness, but only a negation of the act of being: in a word, *relative nonbeing*.[50] The combination of the act of being, or existence (which represents perfection), with relative nonbeing, or essence (which represents imperfection), distinguishes any finite being from God or any other finite being. The creature is thus a composite of being and nonbeing. The more a creature approaches God the more it has of being, the more it recedes from God the more it has of nonbeing. Because the creature is infinitely distant from God, it has more of nonbeing than of being.

From a Suarezian viewpoint "relative nonbeing" looks like a reified nonexistence endowed with some sort of spectral reality. Suárez rejects limitation by any sort of nonbeing (which is nothing, and can do nothing), and declares that what unites divided entities is "being" (in one level of abstraction) and what divides them is still "being" (in a

50 This is the term used by John F. Wippel, in his *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being*. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000.

different level of abstraction). The concept that unites is more general; the concept that divides is more particular. The *general* concept, less distinctly focused, considers an object according to some similitude or conformity it has with other things, while the *particular* concept, which is the same concept more sharply focused *per maiorem expressionem*, considers an object according to the determinate mode in which it exists in fact.

4. Finally, Suárez does what his critics think is impossible—combines the unitary concept of being (which for them is always univocal) with the particular beings interrelated by analogy. For (classical) Thomism this supposed antinomy is only resolved by making the concept of being not one but multiple [See Chapter 4, section 3, below.]

V. PROOFS OF THE ALLEGED ESSENTIALISM OF SUÁREZ

1. Suárez portrayed as an existentialist

The evidence that Gilson presents in support of his contention that Suárez is an essentialist is not easy to make sense of. In some passages, the Doctor of Coimbra is portrayed as an existentialist; in others, as an essentialist. Existentialism appears to condition his thought when he maintains that

> in the primary signification, the term "being" seems to have designated as first all being endowed with actual and real existence: that which the verb "to be" properly signifies, of which it is the present participle.[51]

And speaking of the Suarezian "essence," the French Thomist observes:

> In so far as it is that which the act of existence confers first to any thing, it takes the name of "essence." Essence, whose name derives from *esse* [to exist] …[52]

Hence, Suarezianism is "a doctrine in which the realness of essences is defined by their fitness for existence."[53] So Suárez's notion of existence is thus explained:

51 Gilson, *Être*, p. 143.

52 Gilson, *Être*, p. 144.

53 Gilson, *Being*, p. 97.

> Existence then is to him... the supreme mark of reality. He accordingly declares that existence is a formal and intrinsic constituent of reality properly so-called. "Existence," Suárez says, "is that whereby, formally and intrinsically, a thing is actually existing"; whereupon he adds that "although existence be not a formal cause strictly and formally said, it nevertheless is an intrinsic and formal constituent of what it constitutes." Obviously, Suárez is not existence-blind. He knows that real things do exist; what he does not know is where existence can fit in such a philosophical interpretation of reality as his own is.[54]

So it seems that Suárez wanted to be an existentialist, but did not know how:

> If essences are "real" as *aptae ad realiter existendum*, the very nature of possibility is the possibility to exist. *Essentia* therefore regains with Suárez its intrinsic relation to *esse*. At least, it looks so; but we still have to ascertain up to what point it is really so.[55]

2. Suárez portrayed as an essentialist

However, Gilson has no doubt that the failed existentialist of Granada is in fact a pure essentialist, one who was to mislead many a philosopher of later times. With an amazing confidence, the Toronto professor declares:

> What is going on in the mind of Suárez seems perfectly clear. He begins by identifying being with essence…[56] in the order of dignity and of primacy, essence is certainly first among the objects of the mind…[57] in his own notion of being Suárez has no room for existence as such. The whole question is to know if the actuality of the "real essence" does not require an existential act in order to become an existential actuality; but this is a point which Suárez cannot see, because essence is for him identical with being.[58]

No elaborate critique is necessary. It is difficult to see how one can say of Suárez that "essence is for him identical with being;" that he "begins

54 *Ibid*., pp. 101-102.

55 *Ibid*., pp. 97-98.

56 *Ibid*., p. 101.

57 *Ibid*., p. 98.

58 *Ibid*, p. 103.

by identifying being with essence," and that he "has no room for existence as such": and at the same time, speaking of the same thinker, declare that existence "is to him… the supreme mark of reality"; that "the term 'being' seems to have designated at first all being endowed with actual and real existence"; that "existence is a formal and intrinsic constituent of reality properly so-called"; that essence itself "derives from *esse* [to exist]", and that essence "regains with Suárez its intrinsic relation to *esse*."

3. Confusion of possible and aptitudinal existence

The contention that the thought of Suárez is essentialist is further supported by the fatal confusion between the possible and the aptitudinal (or precisive) existences. The distinction is a subtle but crucial one. "Aptitudinal" existence connotes existence as it is presented to the mind, intra-mentally, and not exercised independently of the mind, extra-mentally; actual exercise is prescinded from and not excluded or denied. "Possible" existence, on the other hand, excludes or denies actual exercise. Accordingly, aptitudinal existence can be predicated of God, but not possible existence.

When professor of the Collège de France cites the very words of Suárez, he avoids this confusion between aptitudinal and possible existence:

> What we are now dealing with is a single concept, but taken in two different degrees of precision. And, indeed, used as a noun, *ens* signifies what has a real essence (*essentia realis*), prescinding from actual existence, that is to say, neither excluding it nor denying it, but merely leaving it out of account by mode of abstraction (*praecisive tantum abstrahendo*); on the contrary, taken as a participle (namely as a verb) *ens* signifies real being itself, that is, such a being as has both real essence and actual existence, and, in this sense, it signifies being as contracted.[59]

However, in commenting on this passage, and using his own words (not those of the Doctor), Gilson finds it difficult to appreciate the nuances of Suarezian thought:

> What Suárez means by this last expression is that actually existing being represents a restricted idea of being in general which, as has just been said, includes both possible and actual being at the same

59 *Ibid*., p. 98.

> time... [Wrong: includes both *aptitudinal* (or precisive) and actual being...] Such are the Suarezian data of the problem, and, since actuality is there posited as a particular case of, the Suarezian solution can easily be foreseen…[60]

As the Thomist professor himself recounts, Suárez is not the only one culpable of this confusion. Another philosopher who is said to have had the same problem is that outstanding interpreter of the German Enlightenment, Christian Wolff (1679-1759). For the latter,

> the possible is that which can exist, precisely because, as its concept implies no contradiction, nothing prevents it from existing. And that is precisely how one names being: *Ens, quod existere potest, consequenter cui existentia non repugnat* [Being is said to be what can exist; consequently, to which existence is not repugnant]. One sees how being radically finds itself detached from this datum that is totally empirical and not deducible *a priori*, which is what existence is. To define being, Wolff is content with a simple possibility of existence, which, to begin with, he has reduced to a non-impossibility. To express ourselves in one of these lapidary formulas in which he is rich, we would thus say that the possible is being: *quod possibile est, ens est*.[61]

But Gilson is wrong about Wolff too, for the latter explicitly rejects the identification of being with possibility: *Ratio existentiae sufficiens in possibilitate non contenta... Possibilis adeo et ens non prorsus synonyma sunt* ["The adequate meaning of existence is not contained in possibility… so 'possible' and 'being' are absolutely not synonyms"]. More will be said about Wolff's views in Chapter 6.

4. Irreducibility of Suarezian terminology

Finally, what clinches the case for the essentialism of Suárez is the reading of his terminology in a Thomist sense. An outstanding example is the term "univocal," applied to Suarezian "being." For Suárez, the concept "being"—which is not univocal but analogical—is *simpliciter (licet imperfecte) unum, et secundum quid diversum*. But the simple unity of this concept includes a relationship of inequality and dependence, since it is predicated of particular beings according to an order of priority (God) and posteriority (creature).

---

60 *Ibid*.

61 Gilson, *Être*, pp. 169-170.

The Thomist univocal concept is a simple unity, *simpliciter unum*. The Suarezian univocal concept is more complex: it is a simple unity, but contracted to its particulars (or "inferiors") in an even fashion, indifferently or uniformly, without any particulars deriving their meaning through dependence on other particulars. Thus "being" contains within itself the differences that constitute its particulars, such as "man" and "horse." Both "man" and "horse" share in being, but "horse" shares in it whether or not "man" does, and vice versa. The Suarezian analogical concept, however, is contracted to its particulars in an uneven fashion, attributively and referentially, of some particulars with dependence on other particulars, such as "creature" with reference to the "Creator" and "accident" with reference to "substance." This reference can be described as one of "priority" (God, substance) and "posteriority" (creature, accident).

Suárez emphasizes the distinction (and similarity) between the analogical and univocal concepts in a sufficiently clear manner in the following passage:

> being itself, however abstractly and confusedly it be conceived, of itself postulates this order [of priority and posteriority], so that first and by itself, and so to speak completely, it pertains to God, and by that relationship descends to the others [the creatures], in which it does not inhere except with a relationship or connection with God. In this aspect therefore it runs short of the meaning of the univocal, for the univocal by itself is indifferent in such a manner, that it equally, and without any order or relationship of one to the other, descends to its particulars. Therefore being with regard to God and the creatures is deservedly numbered among the analogical ... being, without doubt, has a great similarity to univocal terms, since it is predicated of God and the creature through the mediation of one concept, absolutely and without addition. It was only this accordance that was taken into account by those who called the notion of being univocal.[62]

62 *DM* 28: 3: 17 [26: 19]: ipsum ens quantumvis abstracte et confuse conceptum, ex vi sua postulat hunc ordinem, ut primo ac per se, et quasi complete competat Deo, et per illud descendat ad reliqua, quibus non insit, nisi cum habitudine et dependentia a Deo; ergo in hoc deficit in ratione univoci, nam univocum ex se ita est indifferens, ut aequaliter, et sine ullo ordine vel habitudine unius ad alterum, ad inferiora descendat; ergo ens respectu Dei et creaturarum merito inter analoga computatur... sine dubio habet ens magnam similitudinem cum terminis univocis, cum medio uno conceptu abso-

Like the term "univocal", the Suarezian "essence" is read Thomistically. As we noted, "essence" for Suárez is identical with "existence," and so has an inclusive sense. Considered apart from existence, essence has no entity whatever; identified with existence, it is a particular determination of the latter. But the Thomist essence, considered apart from existence, is ambiguous: it is unclear whether it has any actuality of itself, or derives that actuality wholly from existence. Both Suarezians and Thomists conceive of essence, when prescinded from existence, as a potency, which, for the Suarezians, is a potency that is purely *objective*, dependent on its cause for its total reality as an object. For the Thomists, however, essence is also a *subjective* potency, a subject, conceivably possessed of some actuality, into which existence is "received" and thus fully actualized.

It is on the basis of such a Thomistic interpretation of the Suarezian essence that Gilson's critique seems to be founded, as can be seen in the following passage:

> When God creates an essence, He does not give it its actuality of essence, which any possible essence enjoys in its own right; what God gives it is another actuality, which is that of existence. Taken in itself, the essence of man is fully actual *qua* essence. For a theologian like Suárez, the "real essence" of the humblest possible being must be eternal and eternally completely determined in the mind of God, so that it can lack no actuality *qua* essence.[63]

It appears, from the Thomist point of view, that there are given created entities (actual essences) that exist independently (each "in its own right") from divine causality. From the Suarezian point of view, there is some ambiguity in the world "actuality" (of essence). For Suárez essence, apart from existence, is "actualized"—or rather "constituted"—in its conceptual structure (*in esse intelligibili*) and not in its ontological structure (*in esse reali et actuali*). The existence of man is contingent, but his essence, which can be expressed in the terms "animal" and "rational," has an eternal, purely mental, significance. No created entity exists independent of divine causality. As Suárez notes,

> it was not proper for the essence of man to have from all eternity any real being in actual fact, because that being does not signify

---

lute et sine addito de Deo et creatura praedicetur, quam solam convenientiam considerarunt, qui illud univocum appellarunt.

63 Gilson, *Being*, p. 102.

> actual and real being, but only an intrinsic connection with its constituent aspects [or "extremes," i.e. "animal" and "rational"]; but this connection is not based on actual being, only on the potential.[64]

Before God causes it, the creature's essence has no actuality whatever; nothing exists that can be "actualized," unless this "actualization" is understood to mean that the total entity of the creature, essence and existence, is produced, and out of totally non-existent is made existent:

> Hence, if the essence of the creature is taken precisely and in itself, and not yet produced, is considered as actual being: either actual being is attributed to it, and then it is either not considered in itself, but only in its cause, for it has no other real being but the being of its cause; or if it is considered as having being in itself, it is thus true that according to that consideration that it is not real being, but a purely notional one [*ens rationis*], because it does not exist in itself, but only objectively in the intellect.[65]

Gilson is uncomfortable with the fact that Suárez "does not ascribe eternal being to possible essences, since, as mere possibles, they are nothing real." The French Thomist goes on to say:

> I cannot help wondering how he himself has not seen what followed from this obvious truth for his own doctrine. If of itself an essence is a mere possible, and if a mere possible is nothing, what will be the result of its actualization? Nothing. The existential nothingness of

64 *DM* 31: 2: 8 [26: 231]: non oportuit essentiam hominis habere ex aeternitate aliquod esse reale in actu, quia illud esse non significat actuale esse et reale, sed solam connexionem intrinsecam talium extremorum [scilicet animalis et rationalis]; haec autem connexio non fundatur in actuali esse, sed in potentiali.

65 *DM* 31: 2: 10 [26: 232]: Quocirca, si essentia creaturae praecise et secundum se sumpta, et nondum facta, consideretur ut actu ens, vel ei tribuatur actu esse, sic vel non est consideranda in se, sed in sua causa, nec habet aliud esse reale ab esse suae causae; vel si consideretur ac in se habens esse, sic verum est, secundum eam considerationem, non esse ens reale, sed rationis, quia non est in se, sed obiective tantum in intellectu.

> the possible essence is precisely what compels us to look outside the order of essence for an intrinsic cause of its actual reality.[66]

Suárez had already replied to this objection, observing that nothing that is not God, like a creature's essence, has any actuality independent of His power, so its "actualization" is no more than the total conferment on it of existence through God's creative act:

> [The objectors] may perhaps say that though God creates the being of existence out of non-existence, because He creates out of nothing, He does not however create essence from a nothing of essence. For, unless essence is presupposed, it cannot be understood that a thing is creatable by God. Those who respond in this manner are clearly laboring under an equivocation, for, if by essence they understand a thing that is solely in objective potency, we are not considering that, because as such it is nothing at all... If we are speaking of actual essence, which is truly some entity outside God, it is wholly false that God does not produce a created essence simply and absolutely out of a nothing of essence, because He does not produce a created essence out of its own essence, since that is impossible... It is evident, therefore, that God has the same eminent and singular reason in producing essence, which He has in producing existence.[67]

To put it simply: there is no *essence* "out there" waiting to be "actualized" by God conferring *existence* upon it. Before God's causal activity, there is nothing "out there." Then, at one fell swoop, God's power creates a being, "actualizing" both its essence and existence.

66 Gilson, *Being*, p. 104.

67 *DM* 31: 9: 25 [26: 266]: Dicent fortasse, licet Deus faciat esse existentiae ex nulla existentia, quia facit ex nihilo, non vero facere essentiam ex nulla essentia, seu ex nihilo essentiae, quia, nisi essentia supponatur, non potest intelligi quod res sit factibilis a Deo. Qui vero sic respondent, plane in aequivoco laborant, nam, si per essentiam intelligant rem in sola potentia obiectiva, nos de illa non agimus, quia illa ut sic nihil est... Si vero loquamur de essentia actuali, quae vere sit aliqua entitas extra Deum, falsissimum est non facere Deum essentiam creatam simpliciter et absolute ex nulla essentia, quia nec facit creatam essentiam ex suamet essentia, cum id sit impossibile... Constat igitur, eamdem eminentem et singularem rationem habere Deum in efficienda essentia, quam habet in efficienda existentia.

SEQUEL. THE ANAMORPHOSIS OF SUÁREZ

Gilson's portrayal of Suárez as an essentialist made a deep impression on many later thinkers. As the life of that Thomist historian was nearing its end, a fresh development in Suárez scholarship was taking place, one impacted by Gilson himself, but even more by Heidegger (1889-1976),[68] whom we have not seldom encountered in these pages. For some thinkers, even serious ones, his pronouncements were like oracles, one of which was that Western philosophers had forgotten Being and immersed themselves in the study of beings. The inability of these philosophers to unveil Being concealed under particular beings had been a disaster, they said, for the multi-millennial tradition of European metaphysics. Heidegger was around 38 when he arrived at this conclusion (1927); he was to live for another 49 years, but even to the end of that time (1976) he could not make up his mind what exactly the philosophers in question had forgotten about Being and why this forgetfulness was as disastrous as he said it was. (Not to mention the fact that one was unsure whether there was such a thing as "Being" at all, and not just individual beings.) However, not all philosophers affected by his thinking viewed Heidegger as a prophet, as was doubtless the case with some of our critics of Suárez: what is clear is that these critics were widely versed in the history of Western philosophy and were authors of monographs, celebrated for their erudition, on philosophers like Parmenides, Aristotle, Descartes and Schelling, in addition to Suárez, Husserl and Heidegger (whose peculiar terms, like "onto-theo-logy,"[69] they adopted). Three of these scholars may be mentioned: Jean-François Courtine (1944, evidently the initiator of this phase of criticism),[70] Jean-Luc Marion

68 Martin Heidegger, "The Concept of Metaphysics in Franz Suárez and the Fundamental Character of Modern Metaphysics", in *Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik. The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, trans. William H. McNeill & Nicholas Walker. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1995.

69 For an evaluation of the term "onto-theology" and its irrelevance to the metaphysics of Suárez see Marco Forlivesi's "Impure Ontology. The Nature of Metaphysics and its Object in Francisco Suárez's Texts," *Quaestio* 5 (2005), pp. 559-586.

70 Jean-François Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, Épiméthée, 1990.

(1946),[71] and Pierre Aubenque (1929).[72] We hesitate to mention a fourth scholar, Jean-Paul Coujou,[73] who functions as the *enfant terrible* of this Heideggerian consortium, and adds a rhetorical flavor to some of the consortium's tenets. It was clear to Coujou that there was an *ontologie de l'existence*, whose major exponent was Aquinas, and an *ontologie de l'essence*, with Suárez a prominent representative.[74] Coujou was determined not to let there be any overlap; with the fervor of an iconoclast, he set about eradicating any suspicion of existentialism that might cloud the Uncommon Doctor's thought. He had no words to describe what he took to be the excesses of the latter's essentialism. Suárez had "abstracted from existence, to lay open the process of constituting an ontology of essence "(*abstraction de l'existence, afin de mettre à jour le processus de constitution d'une ontologie de l'essence*);[75] indeed, he had initiated a "process of the absolutization of essence" (*un processus d'absolutisation de l'essence*);[76] Not only that, Suárez was guilty of identifying "essence with pure possibility" (*identification de l'essence à la pur possibilité*):[77] indeed he had gone on to make even "actual existence a specific modality of the possible" *(l'exister en acte se reduit à une modalité spécifique du possible*).[78] Reducing the actual to the possible: surely the Doctor was not a nihilist? Why not? How could he fail to

71 Jean-Luc Marion, *On Descartes' Metaphysical Prism. The Constitution and the Limits of Onto-theo-logy in Cartesian Thought*. Trans. Jeffrey L. Kosky. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

72 Pierre Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement du concept de l'être", Adelino Cardoso et al., *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Tradição e Modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri 1999, pp. 11-20.

73 Jean-Paul Coujou, "Suárez et la Renaissance de la métaphysique," in his *F. Suárez, Disputes métaphysiques I, II, III*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1998. Referred to as *Disputes*.

74 Jean-Paul Coujou, *Suárez et la refondation de la métaphysique comme ontologie, Étude et traduction de '"Index détaillé de la Métaphysique d'Aristote" de F. Suárez*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Editions de l'Institut Supérieure de Philosophie/Peeters, 1990, Introduction, *33.

75 Coujou, *Disputes*, p. 30.

76 Coujou, *Disputes*, p. 26.

77 Coujou, *Disputes*, p. 27.

78 Coujou, *Disputes*, p. 29.

be? It was clear to Coujou that *l'essentialité de la chose n'est pas de l'ordre de la* realitas, *mais d'un néant absolu*.[79]

In what follows we shall refer mostly to the views of the three more measured and moderate members of the consortium, who developed the ideas of Gilson to their logical conclusion, and can here be discussed as a corollary that completes the elder Thomist's thought. Gilson had reduced the Suarezian being to essence, but had allowed it some ambiguously existential reality. The new scholars voided it of all reference to real existence, and turned it into a representation, to something merely conceivable, or merely possible.[80] In other words, Suarezian being was subjected to dis-existentialization; it was identified with mere possibility (*pouvoir-exister, possibilité*), representability (*représentabilité*) and conceivability/thinkability (*pensabilité, cogitabilitas*). Indeed, the *Doctor Eximius* was alleged to be the forerunner of Leibniz (1646-1716), who had categorically declared that *nihil aliud est realitas quam cogitabilitas* [reality is nothing else but thinkability.][81] In a word, the Uncommon Doctor's existential philosophy underwent a complete representationalist anamorphosis.[82]

---

79 Coujou, *Disputes*, p. 32.

80 On the American scene note the controversy between Wells and Gracia. Norman J. Wells, "*Esse cognitum* and Suárez Revisited," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67-3 (1993), pp. 339-348, appears to classify Suárez as an intra-mentalist (or representationalist), while Jorge J. E. Gracia, "Suárez and Metaphysical Mentalism: the Last Visit," *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67-3 (1993), pp. 349-354, clearly and cogently identifies the Doctor as an extra-mentalist. See also Ibid., "Suárez's Conception of Metaphysics: A Step in the Direction of Mentalism?" *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65-3 (1991), pp. 287-309.

81 Leibniz, *Opuscules et fragments inédits*, ed. L. Couturat, Paris 1903, p. 22.

82 It could vex some Gilsonians that Heidegger himself seems to think that it is really Suárez's approach which is existentialist, while that of Aquinas is conceptual-abstract, hence essentialist. The difference between the two approaches hinges on the distinction between essence and existence, real in Aquinas and conceptual in Suárez. For Aquinas essence has no reality of its own and acquires that reality from existence. Heidegger was of the opinion that nothing can be real by something other than itself. A thing could actually exist only if the two principles of essence and existence were identical, as Suárez affirmed them to be; his approach was therefore judged to be the right one for the level of experience and hence more in accord with the phe-

These commentators habitually gave the Suarezian technical terms Thomist and Heideggerean senses (continuing the precedent set by Gilson). In addition, when quoting the texts of the Doctor of Coimbra justifying their interpretation, they inadvertently omitted those portions of the text that could not be accommodated to their advocacy of representationalism. The complex thinking of these scholars deserves a more extended treatment, not possible in this chapter. We shall therefore limit ourselves to the summary of their thought given by Pierre Aubenque in a presentation at the International Suárez Seminar held in Lisbon in 1998.[83] This summary hinges on four of Suárez's theories which are taken to support the representationalist case of the Heideggerean consortium.

1. Representationalists on the unitary dyad

The first is Suárez's theory of the dual senses of being, the nominal (*ens ut nomen*) and the participial (*ens ut participium*); these scholars alleged that the nominal sense was primary and the participial secondary. Since the nominal sense is supposedly identical with essence (*essentia realis*) and the participial with existence, they argued, it would follow that Suarezian being in its primary sense is essentialist and representationalist. In clearer terms:

> *ens ut nomen* is therefore more fundamental than *ens participium*, since to participate in actual *esse* every being ought to first realize the requisite of being in general, which is the possibility to exist (*pouvoir-exister*). This is the Suarezian reversal, which substitutes, to the primacy of existing—of the *actus essendi* (to which the participating being seemed to be ordered)—the primacy of the possibility to exist, which defines the nominal being, that is to say the thing, *res*.[84]

But this interpretation is incorrect. As we have remarked, Suárez never tires of affirming the primacy of existence; and, in clear formal contradiction to the words just quoted, he declares that the primary sense is

---

nomenological method. Cf. Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology. Translation, Introduction, and Lexicon by Albert Hofstadter*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982, p. 96.

83 Pierre Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement du concept de l'être", Adelino Cardoso *et al.*, *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617) Tradição e Modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 1999, pp. 11-20.

84 Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 16.

not the nominal, but simultaneously the nominal and the participial; for, as we also noted, Suarezian being is a unitary dyad:

> 'being' does not signify a concept common to being nominally and participially considered, but immediately has a duple significance, whereby it signifies either being that prescinds from actual existence, or being existent in actual fact.[85]

In fact, if any of the two aspects of being can be said to have the preeminence, it is the one with the participial (and categorically existential) sense:

> Being first appears to signify a thing having real and actual existence, as the participle of the verb 'to be'; and thence that word is in fact transferred to precisely signify that which has real essence [which is existence intelligibly considered.][86]

Presented as a quote from Suárez (*DM* 2: 4: 5) is the sentence given below. It is supposed to describe Suarezian being in all its senses, and is adduced in support of the claim that this being is essentialist and representational:

> The significance of being consists in its having a real essence, that is to say, what is neither imagined nor chimerical, but true and apt to really exist.[87]

But this is a misquote. The correct citation does not describe Suarezian being in all its senses but only its nominal sense (*vi nominis*), a sense that is still (aptitudinally) existentialist:

> if being is considered insofar as it is the significance of this *word taken in the nominal sense*, its meaning lies in the fact that it has

85 *DM* 2: 4: 9 [25:90]: ens non significat conceptum communem enti nominaliter et participialiter sumpto, sed immediate habet duplicem significationem, qua significat, vel ens praescindendo ab actuali existentia, vel ens actu existens.

86 *Ibid:* Primo enim ens significare videtur rem habentem esse reale et actuale, tanquam participium verbi essendi; inde vero translata est illa vox ad praecise significandum id quod habet essentiam realem.

87 Text quoted by AUBENQUE, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 17: Ratio entis consistit in hoc quod sit habens essentiam realem, id est non fictam nec chymericam, sed veram et aptam ad realiter existendum.

> real essence, that is, not imagined or chimerical, but true and apt to really exist.[88]

2. Representationalists on aptitudinal existence

The second theory of Suárez which is believed to justify the representationalist position is that of the two (out of the three) senses of existence—the aptitudinal and the potential (the third being the actual). These senses (which we have referred to often) are pointedly distinguished by Suárez, but confused by the representationalists. Aptitudinal (or precisive) existence, as we have frequently noted, merely prescinds from, but does not exclude, the actual exercise of existence; potential existence, however, excludes that exercise and signifies what is actually nothing. In other words, aptitudinal existence is existence as presented to intra-mental awareness and not as posited in extra-mental reality; potential existence negates extra-mental reality as long as the existence remains potential. Hence, as Suárez points out, aptitudinal existence can be predicated of God, while the possible or potential existence cannot. But in representationalist thinking "aptitudinal" and "possible" mean the same thing: "being has been reduced to possibility, itself defined by thinkability, that which Leibniz would call *cogitabilitas*."[89] Suárez is declared to be the forerunner of Wolff, who said that "that which can exist is that which does not imply contradiction."[90]

In other words, " *realitas* is no longer defined by reference to existence which actualizes it, but by opposition to nothing… that is to say to the unthinkable."[91] However, for Suárez, the truth is the exact contrary. Reality is nothing but reference to existence, for *esse enim et existere idem sunt*;[92] *ens in quantum ens ab esse dictum est*[93]; *esse aeque*

88 *DM* 2: 4: 5 [25: 89]: si ens sumatur prout est significatum huius vocis in vi nominis sumpti, eius ratio consistit in hoc, quod sit habens essentiam realem, id est non fictam nec chymericam, sed veram et aptam ad realiter existendum.

89 Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 19.

90 *Ibid*., p. 17.

91 *Ibid*.

92 *DM* 2: 4: 1 [25: 88].

93 *DM* 31: 1: 1 [26: 224].

patet ac ipsum ens;[94] and *existentia ut existentia correspondet enti ut sic, estque de intrinseca ratione eius*...[95]

It may be that Suárez absolutizes essence, but he does it through absolutized existence:

> That essence or quiddity be in fact real, cannot be understood without reference to existence and real actual entity: for we do not otherwise conceive of any essence, which does not actually exist, to be real, unless it be such that being an actual entity—which it has by actual existence—is not repugnant to it. Although to exist in actuality is not of the essence of a creature, however the reference to existence, of the aptitude to exist, pertains to its intrinsic and essential concept.[96]

For the representationalists, Suárez is the forerunner not only of the dogmatist Wolff, for whom *quod possibile est, ens est*;[97] but of the critical Kant (1724-1804) himself.

> For Suárez, as later for Kant, the *realitas*, which is opposed to nothing, but which includes nothing more than the simple thinkability, does not in any fashion imply existence, which does not increase in anything the "reality" of a thing. According to Kant's famous example, who is Suarezian even in terminology, there is nothing more to the concept in a hundred existing (*wirklich, actuales*) thalers than in a hundred possible thalers, since the latter have the same reality (*Realität, realitas*), whether they be existent or not.[98]

There is more:

> For Kant, as for Suárez, the opposition possibility-existence is supported by reference to the determining act of the thought which establishes reality. Kant like Suárez wishes to say that the existence

94 *DM* 31: 7: 2 [26: 251].

95 *DM* 50: 12: 15 [26: 969].

96 *DM* 2: 4: 14 [25: 92]: Quod vero essentia aut quidditas realis sit, intelligi non potest sine ordine ad esse et realem entitatem actualem; non enim aliter concipimus essentiam aliquam, quae actu non existit, esse realem, nisi quia talis est, ut ei non repugnet esse entitatem actualem, quod habet per actualem existentiam; quamvis ergo actu esse non sit de essentia creaturae, tamen ordo ad esse vel aptitudo essendi est de intrinseco et essentiali conceptu eius.

97 *DM* 31: 2 10 [26: 232].

98 Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 17.

> adds nothing to the concept, since that is entirely constituted—and drawn out of nothing—by its reality (*realitas*).[99]

An irreconcilable difference in principle exists between the thought of Suárez and that of Kant, notwithstanding any formal similarity in their terminology.[100] Suárez refers to extra-mental existence, Kant chiefly to human understanding—to sensible intuition, perception and sensation. For Suárez, actual existence is a predicate only in the necessary being, not in finite or contingent beings; it is not a determination that is constitutive of creaturely reality. Thus the essential content of a hundred possible thalers is in no way different from the essential content of a hundred actual thalers; actuality adds no essential content, but only a whole new—existential—dimension. However, Suárez notes that:

> although actual existence may not be of the creature's essence, however, reference to existence, or the aptitude to exist, belongs to its intrinsic and essential concept; and in this way being is an essential predicate.[101]

Furthermore, the two philosophers have different points of reference. That of Suárez is possibility and actuality in relation to causality, and ultimately to the causality of the omnipotent God. Causality is existential, for existence is determined by causes. And existence for Suárez is foundational to all thought, and not just an aspect of some conceptual category. Kant's point of reference is not causality but his four categories of thought (quantity, quality, relation and modality), the *a priori* principles grounded in the mind's own structure through which it acquires knowledge. Reality (and its opposite, Negation) is for him

---

99 Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 17, footnote 17.

100 H. *Seigfried*, "Kant's Thesis about Being Anticipated by Suárez?" in L. W. Beck (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress*, Dordrecht, 1972, pp. 510-520.

101 *DM* 2: 2: 14 [25: 92]: Quod vero essentia aut quidditas realis sit, intelligi non potest sine ordine ad esse *et realem entitatem* actualem; non enim aliter concipimus essentiam aliquam, quae actu non existit, esse realem, nisi quia talis est, ut ei non repugnet esse entitatem actualem, quod habet per actualem existentiam; quamvis ergo actu esse non sit de essentia creaturae, tamen ordo ad esse, vel aptitudo essendi est de intrinseco et essentiali conceptu eius; atque hoc modo ens praedicatum est essentiale.

a variety of the category of Quality. Possibility and Impossibility, Existence and Non-existence, are varieties of the category of Modality.

3. Representationalists on analogy

A third theory of Suárez allegedly supporting representationalism is the analogy of being. He himself is said to have maintained that being is univocal and not analogical.

> Suárez clearly leans to univocity. If to "defend analogy" one would have to deny the unity of the concept of being, "it would be better to deny analogy, which is uncertain, than the unity of the concept of being, which is demonstrated by certain reasons."[102]

The opinion of the Heideggerean consortium is partly conditioned by the fact that the term "univocal" is understood in its Thomist sense, as we noted above when we discussed the "Irreducibility of Suarezian terminology," [section V, no. 4]. For Suárez being is both a unity and analogical. He rejects the Thomist analogy, as interpreted by Cajetan (1468-1534), founder or the classical Thomist school. For Cajetan, being has a manifold and not unitary sense; and analogy is based not on (intrinsic) attribution but on (extrinsic) proportionality. Suárez maintains that the unity of being is certain while the Cajetanian analogy, which he holds to be metaphorical, is dubious, and lacking in any metaphysical significance. But that does not mean that analogy as such is in any doubt.

To support their claim that Suarezian being is univocal and not analogical, the Heideggereans usually cite the following passage of Suárez. But when they do, they oddly omit the sentence that follows immediately on the one they cite, here reproduced in italics:

> I assert that all we said on the unity of the concept of being, seem to be by far more clear and certain than that being is analogous [with the Thomist analogy of proportionality]; and hence, in order to defend [the Thomist] analogy, which is uncertain, it was not right to deny the unity of the concept [of being], but if either were to be denied, rather [the Thomist] analogy, which is uncertain, would need to be denied, rather than the unity of the concept (of being), which seems to be proved by certain arguments. *In actual fact however, neither [analogy nor unity of being] need to be denied, because for univocation it is not enough that the concept be in some manner One in*

102 Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 16.

> *itself, but it is necessary that it refer to the Many through equal relationship and order, which the concept of being does not have.*[103]

In truth, analogy is undeniable, for it pertains to the very structure of being:

> But this analogy of being is entirely founded on and arises from the things themselves, which are subordinate in such a way, that they necessarily relate to the One insofar as they are beings. Hence it was not possible to impose the name of being to signify confusedly that which has existence, without it having to signify many things without a reference to One, and it would thus be analogical.[104]

4. Representationalists on the double concept

And fourth and finally, the theory of Suárez (on which the representationalists clinch their case) of the double concept, formal and objective. We discussed these concepts in the Prologue (Section IV, no. 2, "The formal and objective concepts.") and will summarily treat them here. The *conceptus formalis*[105] is the act whereby the intellect conceives of some individual thing or common notion, as when it conceives "man", the act which it produces in the mind to know "man" is called the formal concept. It is called "concept" because it is, so to speak, "conceived" by the mind and is its offspring; it is called "formal" because it is the intrinsic and formal term of the mental conception. The formal concept is always a true and positive thing, and a quality inhering in the mind.

---

103 *DM* 2: 2: 36 [25: 81]: assero omnia quae diximus de unitate conceptus entis, longe clariora et certiora videri, quam quod ens sit analogum [analogia proportionalitatis], et ideo non recte propter defendendam analogiam [thomisticam] negari unitatem conceptus, sed si alterum negandum esset, potius analogia [thomistica], quae incerta est, quam unitas conceptus, quae certis rationibus videtur demonstrari, esset neganda. *Re tamen vera neutram negari necesse est, quia ad univocitatem non sufficit quod conceptus in se sit aliquo modo unus, sed necesse est aequali habitudine et ordine respiciat multa, quod non habet conceptus entis.*

104 *DM* 28: 3: 22 [26: 21]: At vero haec analogia entis omnino fundatur et oritur ex rebus ipsis, quae ita sunt subordinatae, ut necessario ad unum referantur quatenus entia sunt, ideoque non potuit nomen entis imponi ad significandum confuse quod habet esse, quin consequenter habuerit significare multa cum habitudine ad unum, atque ita fuerit analogum.

105 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 64-65].

The *conceptus obiectivus*,[106] for its part, is the thing or notion which is properly and immediately known and represented to the mind by the formal concept. As when it conceives "man," the man known and represented by the formal concept is called the objective concept. So the objective concept, in its full sense, not a really concept, but is termed "concept" by an extrinsic denomination to the formal concept. But it is rightly called "objective" because it consists of the object or matter about which the formal concept is concerned, to which the insight of the mind (*mentis acies*) is directed. It can be a true and positive thing, but it can also denote privations, mentally fabricated or notional beings (*entia rationis*), and confused and universal notions, phenomena that only exist in the mind. Later philosophers were not satisfied with the heterogeneous content of the objective concept thus described, and sought to discover a unifying category that would encompass that content, and believed to have found it in the notions of "intelligible", "thinkable", "representable" and "supertranscendental."[107] For Suárez, however, the "real" has the preeminence over all these categories; it alone is intelligible in the proper sense, and indeed is the foundation of intelligibility, for *intelligibilitas sequitur entitatem rei*:[108] Says the uncompromising Scholastic realist:

> We showed not only that being was not only not univocal to real and fictitious being, but that it was rather equivocal, or at the most, analogous with the analogy of proportionality. And for this reason we said that the adequate and direct object of metaphysics was not the being that was common to real and fictitious being but to the real only.[109]

---

106 *Ibid*. [25: 65].

107 The philosophers who speculated on the basis of a category more comprehensive than the predicamental and transcendental ones were the "supertranscendentalists." See J. P. Doyle, "Extrinsic Cognoscibility: A Seventeenth Century Supertranscendental Notion" in *The Modern Schoolman* 68 (November 1990), pp 57-80. This topic is treated below in Chapter 6, section V.

108 *DM* 8: 7: 34 [25: 307].

109 *DM* 47: 3: 3 [26: 794]: Ostendimus enim ens non solum non esse univocum ad ens reale et rationis, sed vel esse aequivocum, vel ad summum, analogum analogia proportionalitatis. Et hac ratione etiam diximus, obiectum adaequatum et directum metaphysicae non esse ens commune ad reale et rationis, sed ad reale tantum.

Indeed, concepts that seek to establish a unity between the real and the fictitious have more a verbal than a philosophical value:

> the division of being into the real and fictitious was not rightly numbered among the divisions of being, because that was more a division of name than of reality.[110]

Representationalists, however, see in Suárez classifying all of knowledge, whether it refers to intra-mental or extra-mental reality, under the rubric of "concept," a clear proof of his conceptualization of all reality, of its reduction to thinkability or representability. The Suarezian formal concept does not (it seems) merely disclose things as they are but in some fashion conditions their content: "the objective concept objectivizes beings by means of the formal concept,"[111] and "Being has no other objectivity than the fact of being thought and represented, or to describe it otherwise, of giving place to a formal concept."[112] The way is now open to philosophers like the Calvinist Cartesian Johann Baptist Clauberg (1622-1665), who defines being as *omne quod cogitari potest*,[113] so that ontology "does not consider being in terms of itself… Rather, it considers being truly and first on the basis of the *cogitatio*, therefore in the role of *ens cogitabile*."[114] Such ideas, whether or not they can be traced to Suárez, are certainly expressed with clarity by the philosopher alleged to be (in Gilson's words) the "disciple of the disciples of Suárez", Descartes (1596-1650), who "abandons ontology—science of *ens in quantum ens*—because he tries to fix the conditions for the representation of beings—*ens in quantum cognitum*."[115]

But the representationalists (with their insistence of the primacy of thought) are not entirely wrong. However uncompromising Suárez may be in affirming the primacy of *ens reale* and in rejecting any attempt to reduce his thought to representation, in the use that he makes

---

110 *DM* 4: 7: 4 [25: 138]: divisio entis in ens reale et rationis non recte inter divisiones entis numeratur, quia illa magis est divisio nominis quam rei.

111 Jean-Luc Marion, *On Descartes' Metaphysical Prism*, p. 84, footnote 24.

112 Aubenque, "Suárez et l'avènement," p. 14.

113 Johann Baptist Clauberg, quoted by Marion, *On Descartes' Metaphysical Prism*, p. 83.

114 *Ibid*., p. 84.

115 *Ibid*., p. 83.

of the dual concept, formal and objective, to clarify the notion of being, especially its unity, his thinking takes a revolutionary first step to suggesting the primacy of consciousness over that of being, and thus acting as a hinge on which philosophy will swing from Scholasticism to modernity. Suárez asserts, as a universal principle, that *uni conceptui formali unus conceptus obiectivus respondet*;[116] and that we can prove the unity of being from the point of view of the formal as of the objective concept, because

> we argue often from the one to the other, not indeed by creating a vicious circle, but taking from each what was better known to us, or which was more easily conceded by others.[117]…

But intra-mental consciousness is more accessible to us (*nobis notius*) than extra-mental reality, as its acts are produced "by us and in us"(*a nobis et in nobis*):

> the formal concept, insofar as it comes to be by us and in us, could be better known to experience, however, the exact knowledge of its unity much depends on the unity of the object, from which acts customarily take their unity or difference.[118]

The truth known to consciousness still needs to conform to extra-mental reality. However, when the latter becomes difficult to ascertain, like the vexing problem of the unity of being, recourse to consciousness, which is *experientia notior*, may provide the solution:

> Hence in this disputation we chiefly intend to explain the objective concept of being as such, according to its entire abstraction, in accordance with which we said it was the object of metaphysics. But because this is very difficult, and much dependent on our understanding, we made a start from the formal concept, which, as it seems to us, can be better known.[119]

116 *DM* 2: 2: 3 [25: 70].

117 *DM* 2: 2: 24 [25: 78]: ab uno ad aliud saepe argumentamur, non quidem vitiosum circulum commitendo, sed de unoquoque sumendo quod nobis notius, aut ab aliis facilius concessum videtur.

118 *DM* 2: 1: 9 [25: 68]: formalis (conceptus), quatenus a nobis et in nobis fit, videatur esse posse experientia notior, tamen exacta cognitio unitatis eius multum pendet ex unitate obiecti, a quo solent actus suam unitatem et distinctionem sumere.

119 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65]: In hac ergo disputatione praecipue intendimus explicare conceptum obiectivum entis ut sic, secundum totam abstractionem

Never before in Scholasticism had extra-mental reality been made dependent for its truth on an intra-mental concept. A whole new kind of philosophy was waiting to be born. Some time later, the "disciple of the disciples of Suárez" was to infer (*ergo*) the truth of the extra-mental reality "I am" (*sum*) from the better-known (*notior*), indeed indubitable, intra-mental consciousness, expressed as "I think" (*cogito*). Can we conclude then, without exaggeration, that the little word *notior*, which suggests the primacy of consciousness over being, was to become the minuscule spark that was to ignite the immense conflagration of modern philosophy?[120]

suam, secundum quam diximus esse metaphysicae obiectum; quia vero est valde difficilis, multumque pendens ex conceptione nostra, initium sumimus a conceptu formali, qui, ut nobis videtur, notior esse potest.

120 It is interesting to note that, in his definition of God, Suárez accords consciousness (or intelligence) precedence over being. [See Chapter 4.] For while for the Thomists God is *ipsum esse subsistens*, for Suárez His specific nature is better characterized as *ipsamet intellectio subsistens* (*DM* 30: 15: 15; 26: 174). For while *esse* is the greatest of perfections, the most perfect form of *esse* is *intellectio*.

CHAPTER 4
THE SUAREZIANIZATION OF THOMISM: JOHN OF ST. THOMAS

I. THOMISM'S CONFRONTATION WITH SUAREZIANISM

1. Suarezianized Thomism
2. Original Thomist philosophers vs. "Commentators"

II. THE SUAREZIAN CRITIQUE OF CLASSICAL THOMISM

1. Thomist reification of concepts
2. Thomist reification and individuation
3. Critique of Thomist individuation

III. SUAREZIAN AND THOMIST BEING: SOME DIFFERENTIALS

1. The existentiality of being
2. The unity of being
3. Imperfect precision of being from its particulars

IV. SUAREZIAN FEATURES OF JOHN OF ST. THOMAS'S THOUGHT

1. Suarezian main divisions of being: being by essence and by participation
2. Thomist main divisions of being: unlimited act and limited act
3. Redundancy of Thomist principle of limitation
4. Thomist acceptance of Suarezian analogy

V. CONCORD OF THE TWO DOCTORS, ON THE GODHEAD AND THE TRINITY

1. Definition of the divine nature in Suárez and John
2. The Suarezian definition's relevance to Trinitarian problems
3. John's harmonization of the Suarezian and Thomist definitions

Before igniting the wildfire of Western philosophy the system of Suárez—mediator between Scholasticism and modernity—affected the other Scholastic systems in the ways that we have seen, principally by liberating them from the commentarial method and the tyranny of the Aristotelian text, and by offering them a model of a super-system. The most widely prevalent Scholastic system was of course, Thomism, which the philosophy of Suárez conditioned even in its thought content, chiefly through the work of the foremost Baroque Thomist, João de S. Tomas/John of St. Thomas, or João Ponçote/John Poinsot (1589-1644), sometimes known as the *Doctor Profundus*.[1]

I. THOMISM'S CONFRONTATION WITH SUAREZIANISM

From the time of its inception, Thomism has come under attack: first from the Augustinians, then from the Scotists, and later from the Nominalists. But the greatest challenge was undoubtedly Suárez himself. His critique was effective enough to challenge Thomism to undergo what may be called a process of "Suarezianization"—the adoption of Suarezian tenets while retaining Thomist vocabulary, or else the retention of Thomist tenets but couched in Suarezian language. (As late as 1956 an important Thomist, Cornelio Fabro, 1911-1995, complained of *l'intention assez commune à la néoscolastique de concilier les positions maîtresses du thomisme avec la métaphysique suarézienne*.) [2] We shall, in the present chapter, discuss the impact of the philosophy

---

1 Article published as "John of St. Thomas and Suárez," in *Acta Philosophica* 4-2 (1995), pp. 115-136. Changes made here.
Our quotations from John of St. Thomas are taken from the following:

> 1. Joannes a Sancto Thoma, O. P., *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus*. Beatus Reiser, OSB [ed.]: Torino/Taurinum, 3 vol., 1930-1937. Vol. 1, *Ars logica*. Vol. 2, *Naturalis philosophiae*, partes I et III. Vol. 3, *Naturalis philosophiae*, pars IV.
>
> 2. Joannes a Sancto Thoma, O. P., *Cursus theologicus*. *In Primam Partem Divi Thomae commentarii*. Solesmes Benedictines [eds.]. Paris: Desclée, vol. 1, 1931; vol. 2, 1934.

2 Cornelio Fabro, "Actualité et originalité de l'<esse> thomiste," *Revue thomiste*, 56 (1956), p. 483: "the intention, quite common in Neoscholasticism, of reconciling the major positions of Thomism with Suarezian metaphysics."

of Suárez on that of John of St. Thomas—classical Thomism, organized by the Dominican Cajetan (1468-1524), and systematized by the Dominican John of St. Thomas and the Carmelites of Salamanca, the *Salmanticenses* (1631-1704): its tenets were formulated in the 24 Theses approved by the Sacred Congregation of Studies in 1914. Classical Thomism was the normative form of the system from the 16th century to the early 20th (when it was represented by the Dominican Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, 1877-1964), but was challenged in the mid-20th by newer interpretations of that philosophy, like the Transcendental Thomism of the Jesuit Joseph Marechal (1878-1944) and the Historical Thomism of the layman Etienne Gilson (1884-1978).

1. Suarezianized Thomism

A minor example of the Suarezianization of Thomism is John's abandonment of the time-honored commentarial method, such as had been followed, in the exposition of the system, by Cajetan and by Suárez's older Dominican contemporary Domingo Báñez (1528-1604); indeed, by his younger Jesuit colleague Gabriel Vázquez (1549-1604) himself. Before the time of Suárez instruction relied on commentary—of philosophy on the writings of Aristotle, and of theology on the texts of masters such as Peter Lombard. Suárez himself had begun his career employing the commentarial method, when working on the topic of the Incarnation, one that had been treated by Aquinas in the third part of his *Summa theologiae*. In these early works, Suárez's commentary on Thomas's text was followed by "disputations," divided into "sections," and subdivided into numbers, arranged in Suárez's own order, not that fixed by Aquinas. In lecturing on the Incarnation, Suárez found that he had often to interrupt his theological discourse to clarify the topic's philosophical presuppositions. He then decided that theology would best be served if all its philosophical postulates were to be organized into one complete and consistent work. This work was the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* (1597), the first modern treatment of comprehensive metaphysics not written as a commentary on Aristotle, and where the discipline is structured in an organic way. With it began the definitive abandonment of the commentarial method by Baroque theologians, including John of St. Thomas.

But the systematics of Suárez differs from that of John. Suárez imposes his own order on the entire work, on the principal and subordi-

nate themes, on their outlines and details. For John of St. Thomas, the plan of his total opus is an assemblage of the pertinent treatises of the Scholastic tradition (on logic, natural philosophy and theology) of Aristotle (384-322 B. C.), Porphyry (c. 232-c. 304), Petrus Hispanus/John XXI (c. 1210-1277) and of course Aquinas. This method is particularly evident in his *Cursus theologicus*, his masterwork, where he follows the order of the questions of Aquinas's *Summa*. However, after summarizing the Master's questions, John proceeds to express his own ideas in disputations, arranged in his own order and not that of Thomas. In brief: the architectonics of Suárez may be described as *macro-systematic* and that of John of St. Thomas as *micro-systematic*. Inspired by Suárez's super-system—the melding, by a single thinker, of a systematized theology with a systematized philosophy into one organic unit, with the latter the basis of the former—John forged a Thomist super-system on a grand scale.

2. Original Thomist philosophers vs. "Commentators"

It has become customary to call the great Thomists of the Renaissance and the Baroque "Commentators." [The picture emerges of a portly panjandrum surrounded by his adoring acolytes.] It is demanded of them that they be faithful interpreters of the *mens Divi Thomae*. It is as if philosophy and theology were no more than an exegesis on Thomas, and not an independent investigation into the truth. But these "Commentators" deserve to be considered philosophers in their own right, no differently from any of their modern counterparts. John of St. Thomas himself is one of the great Thomists remarkable for their originality, for he was "the first semiotician to systematize the foundations of a doctrine of signs,"[3] related to the communication between man and God, man and man, and man and nature. These Thomists may be considered commentators in the sense that Aquinas himself is a commentator, for, among a total of sixty of his writings devoted to theology and philosophy, most of them (around forty) are commentaries and only twenty or so are independent works. The "commenta-

3 John Deely, "Semiotic in the Thought of Jacques Maritain," *Recherches sémiotiques*, 6 (1986), no. 2, p. 112. For a more detailed characterization of this originality see the author's *Tractatus de Signis. The Semiotic of John Poinsot*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, Editorial Afterword, especially pp. 491-514.

tors" can also be thought of as Thomists in the sense that Aquinas is an Aristotelian. They commented on Aquinas just as Aquinas commented on Aristotle, but no one today would identify Aquinas merely as an Aristotelian commentator.

II. THE SUAREZIAN CRITIQUE OF CLASSICAL THOMISM

1. Thomist reification of concepts

It is pertinent now to compare these two irreducible systems, the Suarezian and the Thomist. For Suárez the basic principles of Thomism are, at best, open to debate[4] and are unnecessary to found a metaphysics, a fact that makes the system, when not fallacious, superfluous. The rationale of Suárez's critique of classical Thomism is that it *tends to reify concepts*, to treat ideas as things. Aquinas himself condemns such reification in the following words:

> It is not however necessary that the things which are distinct according to the intellect be so in reality, because the intellect does not apprehend things according to the manner of things, but according to its own manner.[5]

This asymmetry between mind and reality is explained by Suárez as follows. Speaking of the mental distinction with an extra-mental basis (*distinctio rationis cum fundamento in re*), in a long passage quoted in Chapter 2 (cf. footnote 6), Suárez observes that such a distinction is made through inadequate concepts of the same thing, none of which

4 The Thomist system, to some of its critics, seems to be replete with confusions, attributed to the founder himself. One such recent critic, speaking of Aquinas, thinks that his teaching of being, though widely admired, is one of the least of his contributions to philosophy. Thomas speaks of being in at least 12 different ways, says the critic, but he never systematically sorts out the contrasts, relationships and overlaps between these ways. It is often difficult to be sure what exactly he is talking about in any context of which being is the topic. Cf. Anthony Kenny, ***Aquinas on Being***. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

5 Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 50, art. 2: Non est autem necessarium quod ea quae distinguuntur secundum intellectum sint distincta in rebus; quia intellectus non apprehendit res secundum modum rerum, sed secundum modum suum.

conceive exactly all that the thing has, or exhausts its essence and objective significance.

2. Thomist reification and individuation

Reification seems to obtain in the Thomist principle of individuation, quantified matter (*materia signata quantitate*). Nature is said not to include the note of individuality in its essence; to become individual it requires to be "circumstantiated," John of St. Thomas claims, by quantified matter. Suárez, on the other hand, maintains that,

> every singular substance needs no other principle of individuation besides its own entity, or besides the intrinsic principles by which its entity is constituted.[6]

Entities, as exist outside the mind, are by themselves singular; they are not universals reified or singularized. Still, as John of St. Thomas points out, "the express opinion of St. Thomas, in innumerable places, is that quantified matter is the first principle of individuation."[7]

What then is one to say about the fact that whatever is posited in reality is singular? John responds:

> by this very fact, that it is posited in reality, it is not posited bare and unconnected from every circumstance and state of incommunicability, but is posited in combination with that state—and in this way it is turned into a singular and individual entity, not by reason of its entity absolutely considered, but as circumstantiated and incommunicable. Therefore it is one thing [to say] that a nature posited in reality is singular, and another [to ask] by virtue of what principle and basis it is singular and this particular thing. And although nature by itself is indifferent to a plurality of individuals by a negative indifference [in that it prescinds from, but does not exclude, individuals], nonetheless, this indifference needs to be removed not by an essential principle, but one modificative of the essence. This is because the indifference referred to is only of such a

6 *DM* 5: 6: 1 [25: 251]: omnem substantiam singularem, neque alio indigere individuationis principio praeter suam entitatem, vel praeter principia intrinseca quibus eius entitas constat.

7 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus, Naturalis philosophiae*, pars III, q. 9, art. 3. Vol. 2 (Reiser ed.), p. 781: Expressa Divi Thomae sententia est innumeris locis materia quantitate signata esse primum principium individuationis.

> kind that the nature has to be modified and materialized by singularity and individuation, and not further constituted in its essence.[8]

3. Critique of Thomist individuation

A Suarezian critique of Thomist individuation[9] would be to ask if that absolute nature, which is indifferent to a plurality of individuals, is itself a singularity or an abstraction. If it is a singularity, it is individual by itself and needs no further principle of individuation. If it is an abstraction, it cannot, *unless reified*, be individuated by any modifier really distinct from itself. Since it is an abstract concept, its modifier need only be an added conceptual qualification. Thus, given the mind's inability to grasp the rich content of reality except through a plurality of concepts—an intra-mental plurality that does not necessarily imply an extra-mental one—the intelligible content of the same singular individual posited in reality can be conceived as constituted of two conceptual integrants, one signifying its absolute or common nature and the other its modifying incommunicability. Suárez himself specifically addressed this problem. The opinion that each entity is self-individuated does not, he observes, deny that

> in that individual entity it is possible to distinguish the common nature from the singular entity, and for this particular individual to add, over and above the species, something conceptually dis-

8 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus, Naturalis philosophiae*, pars III, q. 9, art. 3. Vol. 2 (Reiser ed.), p. 775: quod hoc ipso, quod ponitur in re, non ponitur nuda et absoluta ab omni circumstantia et statu incommunicabilitatis, sed cum illa [illo], et ita redditur unitas singularis et individua, non ratione entitatis absolute sumptae, sed circumstantionatae et incommunicabilis. Itaque aliud est quod natura posita in re est singularis, aliud ex quo principio et radice habet, quod sit singularis et haec. Et licet natura secundum se sit indifferens ad plura indifferentia negativa, tamen ista differentia tolli debet non per principium essentiale, sed per modificativum essentiae, eo quod illa differentia solum est, ut natura modificetur et materializaretur per singularitatem et individuationem, non autem ut amplius quidditative constituetur.

9 For a masterly treatment of individuation see Jorge J. E. Gracia (ed.), *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150-1650*. State University of New York Press, 1994. See also ibid., *Suárez on Individuation. Metaphysical Disputation V: Individual Unity and its Principle*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 1982. I am greatly indebted to its excellent Glossary, pp. 175-279.

> tinct, which according to the metaphysical consideration has the significance of an individual differentia. But the opinion nevertheless adds... that the individual differentia does not, in the individual substance itself, have any special principle, or basis, which in reality is distinct from its entity. Therefore the opinion affirms that each entity, in this sense, is by itself this principle of individuation.[10]

A careful reading of John of St. Thomas's passage, quoted above, nowhere indicates that he is reifying absolute nature: rather he seems to be treating it, Suarezian fashion, as a distinct conceptual integrant of a singular entity's intelligible content. Except with doctrines which he believes were clearly enunciated by Thomas, and which he defends with unflinching loyalty, John is open to the influence of Suárez, sometimes with unexpected results.

III. SUAREZIAN AND THOMIST BEING: SOME DIFFERENTIALS

Unexpected agreement between the *Eximius* and the *Profundus* is reached on some basic principles of metaphysics, especially on its fundamental notion of being. While the two Doctors agree on much about being, there are some unbridgeable differences which it will be the task of the present chapter to explicate. Thomism has postulates peculiar to itself, shared by no other Scholastic system—like the limitation of Act by receptive potency—which it believes to be more profound than those it shares with Suárez. For his part the *Eximius* argues that the commonly shared postulates disprove the special Thomist ones, or at least render them superfluous. In a strange way, John of St. Thomas seems sometimes to agree. Among the points of disagreement we may select three: existentiality, unity and imperfect precision of being from its particulars.[11]

---

10 *DM* 5: 6: 1 [25: 180]: Non enim negat haec opinio, in illa individua entitate posse ratione distingui naturam communem ab entitate singulari, et hoc individuum addere supra speciem aliquid ratione distinctum, quod secundum metaphysicam considerationem habet rationem differentiae individualis... Sed tamen addit haec opinio... illam differentiam individualem non habere in substantia individua speciale aliquod principium, vel fundamentum quod sit in re distinctum ab eius entitate; ideoque in hoc sensu dicit unamquamque entitatem per seipsam esse haec individuationis principium.

11 For a magisterial analysis of the Suarezian and Thomist notions of being and analogy, see José Hellin, *La analogía del ser y el conocimiento de Dios*

1. The existentiality of being

The first note is *existentiality*, actual and aptitudinal existence, described at some length in the previous chapter. There we pointed out that existence has the absolute primacy in the Suarezian system. As for the Thomist position on this matter, it appears to be twofold, Cajetanian (advanced by Thomas de Vio, Cajetan, 1468-1534, substantialist or essentialist) and Bañezian (Domingo Bañez, 1528-1604, existentialist). Gilson is fond of quoting Bañez's words:

> And this what St. Thomas most often loudly proclaims, and the Thomists don't want to listen: that existence is the actuality of every form or nature.[12]

It needs to be remarked that this principle can by itself be little more than a mantra unless it affects the whole of a philosopher's metaphysics. It is not clear to what extent this true of Bañez, who in general seems to be conventionally Thomist in the substantialist sense.

On the other hand, "The work of Cajetan… is the perfect example of what can be a Thomism without the act of *esse*" [Latin *actus essendi*]. Indeed, says Gilson, Cajetanian metaphysics is an ontology of substance[13]: "let us agree," continues the guru, "to name as 'essential' every ontology or doctrine of being, for which the notion of substance and the notion of being are equivalent."[14]

But the two viewpoints need not clash; they can be harmonized by the basic Thomist principle that Act *[actus essendi]* by itself connotes only perfection and is unlimited; it is not limited except by reception into a distinct potency which connotes a lack of perfection. As the loyal Thomist Joseph Gredt (1863-1940) states it: *Actus non potest esse physice limitatus per seipsum. Non limitatur nisi per potentiam ab actu realiter distinctam in qua recipitur. Actus proinde in nulla potentia receptus est infinitus* "Act cannot be physically limited by itself. It is not limited except by the potency really distinct from Act in what it

en Suárez. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1947.

12 Bañez, *Scholastica Commentaria in Primam Partem Summae Theologiae*, ed. Luis Urbano, Madrid-Valencia 1934, tom. 1, p. 141: Et hoc est quod saepissime D. Thomas clamat, et Thomistae nolunt audire: quod esse est actualitas omnis formae vel naturae.

13 Étienne Gilson, "Eléments d'une métaphysique thomiste de l'être," *Archives d'histoire doctrinal et litteraire du Moyen Age*, Paris 1973, p. 34.

14 Étienne Gilson, *Le Thomisme*, 6th ed., Paris 1965, p. 174.

is received. Consequently Act not received into any potency is infinite.".[15] That Act would naturally be identical with "the actuality of every form or nature" of Báñez, and with the "substance" of Cajetan, as substance is the most perfect form or nature, the highest kind of being. The Thomist principle itself will be discussed below.

As we have observed, for Suárez the primacy of existence is the core insight of his system, a statement that will puzzle the curious reader, as the identical claim has emphatically and repeatedly been made for their system by the Thomists, particularly by the so-called "existential" or "Gilsonian" Thomists. Now both Suarezians and Thomists agree that the objective concept of existence has a kind of unity; they also agree that existence is the "perfection of perfections." In Suarezianism the unitary existence (signified in the objective concept) does not correspond to a unitary extra-mental being, but to multiple beings, most of them created and one increate, with the unitary concept contracted to these multiple particular entities by greater conceptual focusing, *per maiorem expressionem*. [See Chapter III, section 4.] In Thomism, however, this unitary existence corresponds to Act, unlimited and limited, as we have just seen. Apart from the fact that Act can hardly be anything except *simpliciter unum*, we have here what appears to be a reified concept, in the sense that what exists intra-mentally (as a single concept, unlimited Act) corresponds to the manner in which it is affirmed to exist extra-mentally (as a single unlimited being, [pure] Act, limited only when received into limiters).

There is yet another Thomist reification, of essence and existence. As we observed in the previous chapter, for some Thomists, like Gilson, there are two actualities, of essence and of existence.[16] The actuality of essence is apparently independent of God's causality, only the actuality of existence is dependent on it. But for Suárez it is inconceivable that the essence of a creature have any sort of actual being from all eternity independent of God. Essence, apart from existence and causal activity, has no actuality whatever, but is merely a mentally-appraised coherence of its intelligible constituents, as "animal" and "rational" in the case of "man". It is not a kind of existent-nonexistent phantom (or a reified concept) waiting to be actualized. Before the creature is caused

15 Joseph Gredt, "Doctrina thomistica de potentia et actu contra recentes impugnationes vindicatur," *Acta Pontificiae Academiae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, N.S. I, 1934, p. 33.

16 Etienne Gilson, *Being*, p. 102.

nothing exists that can be "actualized," unless this "actualization" is intended to mean that the total entity of the creature, essence and existence, is produced, and out of totally non-existent is made existent. All these notions were examined above.

2. The unity of being

The second note is *unity*. "Being" is the content of

> one objective concept, adequate and immediate, which expressly signifies neither substance nor accident, nor God nor creature, but all these in the manner of a unity, that is to say, in so far as they are in some way similar and concur in existing... This objective concept prescinds in its meaning from all its particulars or members dividing being, even though they be entirely simple entities.[17]

Suarezian being is *simpliciter unum et secundum quid diversum*. At this point it is appropriate to contrast the classical Thomist position with the Suarezian. Thomism's tenets provide John with only two options to choose from: a unitary univocal concept or a multiple analogical concept of being. In the following passage he argues against the first option and in favor of the second, as

> this concept, which is one, imperfect and inadequate, so prescinds from its inferiors that it remains in potency with regard to them and is contractible by the addition of a differential concept; it is deduced from that fact that it would thus be univocal. For "animal" is univocal to all its species, because it is conceived as actually one in such a way that it possesses the dividing differences only in potency and is divided by their addition. Therefore the analogical concept, which lacks this kind of unity, but has unity only in a certain sense, must not include the diversity of its inferiors only in potency; for in this way it would remain simply one in actuality, which is what being univocal means, and it would be multiple and diverse only in po-

17 *DM* 2: 2: 8 & 15 [25: 72 & 75]: unum conceptum obiectivum adaequatum et immediatum, qui expresse non dicit substantiam neque accidens, nec Deum nec creaturam, sed haec omnia per modum unius, scilicet quatenus sunt inter se aliquo modo similia et conveniunt in essendo... hic conceptus obiectivus est secundum rationem praecisus ab omnibus particularibus seu membris dividentibus ens, etiamsi sint maxime simplices entitates.

> tentiality. In order that the concept not remain one simply, it must actually include diversity, though it need not actually explicate it.[18]

In choosing the second option John compares being as multiply conceived to a heap of sand seen from a distance. Though he upholds the doctrine of the unlimited Act, he is emphatic about excluding any strict unity from "being"; so in order that it not "not remain one simply, it must actually include diversity, though it need not actually explicate it" (*Ut ergo non maneat simpliciter unum, actu debet includere diversitatem, licet actu non explicet illam*).

Here we again remark on the difference of univocity as Thomistically and Suarezianly conceived. The Thomist univocal is a concept that has a simple unity. The Suarezian is more complex: it is a simple unity, but is applied to its inferiors indifferently, without any relationship of dependence (such a relationship renders the concept analogical. See Chapter 3, section V, no. 4.). As for the Thomist "being," *simpliciter diversum et secundum quid unum*, it seems from the Suarezian viewpoint to be no different from the Nominalist universal, which is but a collection of particulars. As the *Magister Incomparabilis* (*Venerabilis Inceptor, Doctor Invincibilis*) William of Ockham (c. 1290-c.1349) describes them, universals, like the notion of "man,"

> precisely signify singular things... it must be conceded that this name "man," with equal priority signifies all particular men. It does not follow therefore that this name "man" is equivocal, because though it signifies many particulars with equal priority, nonetheless it signifies them by a single ascription, and in signifying them subordinates them to one concept and not to many, because of which that concept is univocally predicated of them.[19]

18 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus, Ars logica*, pars II, q. 13, art. 5. Vol. 1 (Reiser ed.), p. 493: ita praescindens ab inferioribus, quod maneat in potentia ad illa et sit contrahibilis per additionem conceptus differentialis, ex eo deducitur, quia sic esset conceptus univocus. Nam animal ideo est univocum ad omnes species, quia concipitur ita unum in actu, quod differentias dividentes solum habet in potentia et per earum additionem dividitur. Ergo analogum, quod talem unitatem non habet, sed secundum quid, non debet solum in potentia includere diversitatem inferiorum; sic enim in actu simpliciter maneret unum, quod est esse univocum, et solum in potentia multiplex et diversum. Ut ergo non maneat simpliciter unum, actu debet includere diversitatem, licet actu non explicet illam.

19 William of Ockham, *Summa logicae*, pars 1, cap. 17. Philoteus Boehner, *Venerabilis Inceptoris Guillelmi de Ockham Summa logicae,* Cura Instituti

Likewise, Thomist "being" actually represents all particular beings. As Suárez sees it, a concept constituted of many distinct particulars is no different from many distinct concepts, and their unity is a mere *flatus vocis*. The Thomist response is that its particulars have a uniting principle, "proportional similitude." When we think of the comprehensive categories "being" and "entity," and their determined particulars like "substance" and "quantity," says Cajetan, we note that

> the abstraction of being does not consist in that 'entity' is grasped and 'substance' or 'quantity' not, but in 'substance' and 'quantity' being grasped in the manner in which each is related to its own existence. According to this procedure the proportional similitude is drawn attention to, and 'substance' and 'quantity' are not grasped absolutely speaking.[20]

Thus the relationship of the essence of the creature to its existence is proportional to the relationship of the essence of the Creator to His existence.

Such reasoning, for the Suarezian viewpoint, is fallacious. In proportional concepts relating two beings, like God and the creature, there need to be four terms—creature's essence: creature's existence: God's essence: God's existence. But here there are only three terms. The essence and existence of the creature, which Thomists say are distinct both conceptually and really, form two terms. Contrariwise, the essence and existence of God are not distinct even conceptually but only verbally, being totally convertible; their difference has no foundation

---

Franciscani Universitatis S. Bonaventurae, N. Y. 1974, p. 60: Dicendum est quod talia nomina significant praecise res singulares. Unde hoc nomen "homo" nullam rem significat nisi illam quae est homo singularis, et ideo numquam supponit pro substantia nisi quando supponit pro homine particulari. Et ideo concedendum est quod hoc nomen "homo" aeque primo significat omnes homines particulares, nec tamen sequitur quod hoc nomen "homo" sit vox aequivoca, et hoc quia quamvis significet plura aeque primo, tamen unica impositione significat illa et subordinatur in significando illa plura tantum uni conceptui et non pluribus, propter quod univoce praedicatur de eis.

20 Cajetan, *De nominum analogia*, cap. 5. n. 129. Hyacinthe-Marie Robillard, O. P., *De l'analogie et du concept d'être de Thomas de Vio, Cajetan*. Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1963, pp. 78 & 80: Entis abstractio non consistit in hoc quod entitas apprehenditur et substantia aut quantitas non; sed in hoc quod substantia et quantitas apprehenditur ut sic se habet ad proprium esse; secundum hoc enim similitudo proportionaliter attenditur, et non apprehenditur substantia, aut quantitas absolute.

in reality, so they constitute just one term. Besides, the argument appears to be circular: analogy is a method that aids us in knowing about God; all its notes must be determined before we have any knowledge of Him. But we cannot know what analogy is unless we already have prior knowledge of what the relationship is of God's essence to His existence.

This "existence" is none other than "Act", which is strictly one, and signifies only perfection. An example of how Act retains this unity would be the Platonic idea of white, unaffected by any other color, never losing its unity as whiteness.[21] For Suárez, however, an entity is limited by its efficient cause, which gives it only so much being and no more. But Thomists are emphatic that there can be no limitation without reception of act into limiter potency: if that potency does not cooperate, it would seem that an efficient cause could produce an infinite effect.[22] For Suárez, however, dependence on an efficient cause is the hallmark of imperfection, and constitutes the very essence of the creature, while independence from cause is the source of God's omniperfection. Whether or not potency cooperates, God cannot create another God!

In sum, we noted that the Thomist tradition provides John of St. Thomas with only two options, a unitary univocal concept or a multiple analogical concept of being, and impels him to choose just one, the latter. Our analysis however, reveals that he could have chosen both: the analogical model for "being" in its widest sense, with its innate va-

21 Joseph Gredt, O.S.B., "Doctrina thomistica de potentia et actu contra recentes impugnationes vindicatur," *Acta Pontificiae Academiae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, N. S. I, 1934, p. 36: Thomistae, praeeunte S. Thoma, utuntur sensibili exemplo ad hanc metaphysicam veritatem declarandam: Si albedo tanquam idea platonica essentialiter per se subsisteret, infinita esset in sua linea; nam est id quo in indefinitum unumquodque album est album—nec posset esse nisi una.

22 Joseph Gredt, O.S.B., *op.et loc. cit.*, p. 36: Nec potest dici actum limitari, non per potentiam in qua recipitur, sed per causam efficientem: actum limitationem suam accipere a causa efficiente a qua tanquam limitatus producitur. Causa enim efficiens non potest producere limitatum actum, nisi producat eum tanquam in potentia aliqua receptum. Si producit actum irreceptum, necesse est producat eum prout convenit actui irrecepto, i.e. tanquam infinitum. Ita revera Deus producit substantiam pure spiritualem in sua linea infinitam.

riety, and the univocal model for "Act", or being in the fullest sense, with its innate uniformity.

Then analogy would have a more modest status in the Thomist system. What does Aquinas himself say about analogy? Gilson tells us that

> His texts on the notion of analogy are relatively few, and in each case they are so restrained that we cannot but wonder why the notion has taken on such an importance in the eyes of his commentators.[23]

It was his great "commentator" Cajetan, who seems to have realized analogy's importance, and made it fundamental to the classical Thomist system.

3. Imperfect precision of being from its particulars

The third note is *imperfect precision of being from its particulars* (a topic also examined in Chapter 3). Just as what makes all beings similar to one another is being itself, what differentiates them is also being, for "the notion of being is transcendent, and intimately enclosed in all the particular and determinate types of being" (*rationem entis esse transcendentem et intime inclusam in omnibus propriis et determinatis rationibus entium*).[24] As noted in Chapter 3, the same concept of being, *confusedly considered*, "as such," is what unites them; the same concept, more expressly focused, as "God," "creature," "substance," "accident," is what differentiates them. "The contraction of the concept of being to its particular modes," notes Suárez

> is not to be understood in the manner of a composition, but only in the manner of a more express conception (*per modum expressioris conceptionis*) of any particular being contained under being, in such a way that either concept, whether that of "being" or of "substance," is simple and irresoluble into two concepts, differing only in that one is more determined than the other.[25]

---

23 Étienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, part 1, ch. 5, sect. 2. New York: Random House, 1956, p. 105.

24 *DM* 28: 3: 21 [26: 21].

25 *DM* 2: 6: 7 [25: 101]: non esse intelligendum per modum compositionis, sed solum per modum expressioris conceptionis alicuius entis contenti sub ente; ita ut uterque conceptus, tam entis quam substantiae, verbi gratia,

Some of John of St. Thomas's sentences, taken out of context, sound as though they could have been written by Suárez himself:

> And these very modes contracting being, in so far as they signify entity, are the concept of "being"; in so far as they signify the expression of modification (*expressionem modificationis*), are diverse.[26]

It bears repeating here that the unitary notion of being, for Suárez, is not univocal, because

> although according to its confused significance it is the same, just as it is one, nonetheless it is not entirely the same, because it is not of itself entirely uniform, this uniformity and identity being required by univocals in their essential content.[27]

How does contraction occur in classical Thomism, from general "being" to particular kinds of being? Not per *maiorem expressionem*, but by the explication of a concept that actually contains its multiple particulars, as the grains in a heap of sand.

IV. SUAREZIAN FEATURES OF JOHN OF ST. THOMAS'S THOUGHT

We may now examine whether the reaction of John of St. Thomas to the ideas of Suárez was not just negative or cautionary, but positive as well. In response, it may be said that John, if we may so put it, is the most Suarezian of Thomists, and it would be interesting to investigate just how many of the Jesuit's ideas the Dominican made his own. At least two such ideas can be indicated, the first mainly philosophical and the second philosophical with clear theological implications. First, that the basic principle of Thomism, the limitation of act by potency, is not necessary to found a philosophical system; and second, that the

simplex sit, et irresolubilis in duos conceptus, solumque differant, quia unus est magis determinatus quam alius.

26 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus, Ars logica*, pars II, q. 13, art. 5. Vol. 1 (Reiser ed.), p. 495: Et istimet modi contrahentes ens, quantum ad rationem entitatis, conceptis entis sunt, quantum ad expressionem modificationis, diversi sunt.

27 *DM* 28: 3 :21 [26: 21]: sicut secundum confusam rationem sit eadem, sicut est una, nihilominus non est omnino eadem, quia non est ex se omnino uniformis, quam uniformitatem et identitatem requirunt univoca in ratione sua.

nature of God is best defined not as subsistent being, but as subsistent intelligence.

1. Suarezian main divisions of being: being by essence and by participation

The discussion of "being as such," engaged in above, leads us now to consider the main divisions of being, which for Suárez are "being by essence" (*ens a se*, being by itself) and "being by participation" (*ens ab alio*, being by another). God the Creator is being by essence, and the creature is being by total participation of essence and existence with reference to the Creator.[28] In other words, the creature's essence is *positiva seu radicalis dependentia*. Suárez peremptorily declares:

> In the very first place, therefore, it has to be postulated (something that is accepted as certain by all) that created being, in so far as it is such, essentially includes dependence on the first and uncreated being. Because this is the primary reason that distinguishes created being from the uncreated.[29]

Indeed, continues the Uncommon Doctor,

> it absolutely belongs to the essence of God, that He have full dominion over all created beings, either in actuality or in possibility, so that if He were to wish to produce them, He could not set them up outside His dominion.[30]

From the concept "being by essence" are derived, *a priori*, all the predicates characteristic of God: infinity, unicity, immutability, imitability in effects—the latter predicate being the *a priori* reason for the pos-

---

28 For a summary exposition of Suarezianism see the following works of José Hellin: "Nociones de la potencia y del acto, y suas mutuas relaciones, según Suárez," *Las ciencias*, 17-1 (1952), pp. 91-92; and *Theologia naturalis*, Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1950, pp. 890-896.

29 *DM* 31: 14: 2 & 4 [26: 308]: Principio igitur supponendum est (id quod est certum apud omnes) ens creatum, quatenus tale est, essentialiter includere dependentiam a primo et increato ente. Quia haec est prima ratio distinguens ens creatum ab increato.

30 *DM* 31: 14: 4 [26: 309]: absolute est de essentia Dei, ut habeat plenum dominium omnium creatorum entium, vel actu, vel potestate, ita ut si velit illa producere, non possit extra suum dominium illa constituere….

sibility itself of "being by participation." From the latter concept, in turn, are derived, *a priori*, all the predicates characteristic of the creature, which are: contingence, dependence in conservation and activity, finiteness, potentiality by itself and in combination with act, the multiplication of beings into species and into individuals within each species, univocal similarities of genus and species, and the analogical similarities between substance and accidents, and also between the Creator and creature. In this way the absolute simplicity and unity of "being by essence" is the *a priori* reason for the limitless variety and multiplicity of "being by participation." The concept of "being by essence" is thus the unifying principle of Suárez's system; it defines the basis of what, to his mind, constitutes the simple and comprehensive structure behind the various modes of Scholasticism.

Suárez synthesizes these ideas in a magnificent passage:

> God, as by essence He is the most simple being and infinite, includes essentially and unitively all the perfection of being. Hence the very significance of being insofar as it is in God essentially includes the notion of substance, wisdom, justice, and therefore (what is of primary importance) it essentially includes being itself that is wholly independent and 'of itself;' when however, contrariwise in the creature, the nature of being is wholly dependent and 'from another,' and in each being is limited to a certain class of perfection. And because of this the proper meaning of being is said to be in God by essence, and in creatures through participation. In addition, existence is said to be in Him totally, so to speak, that is, unitively, encompassing all being, and in other entities as though divided into parts. Therefore the significance of being is found in the creatures in comparison with God, in a way that is by far inferior and inadequate, and in consequence being is not affirmed of both univocally or in what is entirely the same sense. For if God and the creature were defined or described in any fashion, it would be discovered that God was being in a different sense altogether than the creature.[31]

31 *DM* 28: 3: 8 [26: 15]: Deus, eo quod sit ens simplicissimum, per essentiam, et infinitum, includit essentialiter et unite omnem perfectionem entis. Unde ipsamet ratio entis prout in Deo est essentialiter includit rationem substantiae, sapientiae, iustitiae, atque adeo (quod praecipuum est) includit essentialiter ipsum esse omnino independens et a se, cum tamen e contrario in creatura ipsamet ratio entis sit omnino pendens et ab alio, et in unoquoque ente est limitatum ad certum perfectionis genus. Et ob hanc causam ratio entis dicitur esse in Deo per essentiam, in creaturis vero per participationem. Item dicitur esse in illo quasi totaliter, id est, quasi unite complectens totum

2. Thomist main divisions of being: unlimited act and limited act

Classical Thomism accepts these postulates but (as we noted) judges its own principles to be philosophically more profound. The most basic of these principles, in its most abstract form, can be stated thus: *a category or being which does not include limitation in its concept acquires that limitation by contact with a really distinct category or being*. One mode of this connection, recently noted, is what is known as "reception." Thus actuality, or act, of itself signifies only perfection and does not connote limitation; to be limited, it has to be received into a really distinct potency, one that signifies such a limitation, as having a capacity for only a certain measure of perfection and no more, *sicut liquor in vase ad eius mensuram se accomodat* ("as the liquor in a vessel adjusts itself to its measure")[32] as John of St. Thomas has it. Another mode of the connection is what, as we have seen, he calls "circumstantiation," which individuates nature by quantified matter.

The illimitability of Act (or existence) and its limitation by reception into a really distinct potency (or essence) is classical Thomism's foundational tenet.[33] As we previously noted, when not limited by reception into that potency, Act is Pure Act and is God Himself. All His predicates, like infinity and others, derive *a priori* from this fundamental illimitability. When limited by reception into that potency, Act is

---

ens, in aliis vero quasi divisa per partes; ergo longe inferiori et inadaequato modo reperitur ratio entis in creaturis respectu Dei, et consequenter non dicitur de illis univoce, neque secundum eandem omnino rationem: nam si Deus et creatura definirentur aut aliquo modo describerentur, longe alia ratione inveniretur Deus esse ens quam creatura.

32 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I, disp. 7, artic. unicus, n. 2. Paris: Desclée, 1931. Vol. 1, p. 547.

33 This is the second of the famous 24 Theses of classical Thomism, approved by the Sacred Congregation of Studies on 27 July 1914: Actus, utpote perfectio, non limitatur, nisi per potentiam, quae est capacitas perfectionis. Proinde in quo ordine actus est purus, in eodem non nisi illimitatus et unicus existit; ubi vero finitus et multiplex, in veram incidit cum potentia compositionem. Says Joseph Gredt, "Doctrina thomistica de potentia et actu contra recentes impugnationes vindicatur," *Acta Pontificiae Academiae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, N. S. I (1930), p. 48: Totum systema thomisticum ultimo fundatur in reali distinctione inter actum et potentiam limitantem actum.

impure or mixed, and constitutes the creature: this limitation is the *a priori* reason for the predicates of the creature alluded to above.

From Suárez's standpoint, this postulate reifies concepts and can be critiqued thus: is the Act or existence that is limited by reception a concept in the mind or a reality independent of the mind? If it is a concept it cannot, *unless reified*, be received into anything really distinct; if, as a concept, it needs to be limited, it merely requires an added conceptual modifier. If, on the other hand, this act or existence is an extra-mental reality, is it illimitable or limitable? If it is illimitable, then nothing, by definition, can limit it, for illimitability will be intrinsic to its nature. If this act or existence is limitable, it is already by that fact limited, since it lacks the perfection of illimitability or infinity.

Undeterred by such arguments, our ever faithful Thomist argues that just as reception implies finitude, irreception implies infinity:

> because if existence be not received (*non sit recepta*) into any nature or form from which it is distinguished, it does not have limitation by reason of a receiving subject, since it lacks that subject... therefore if existence is incapable of being received (*irreceptibilis*), it needs to be infinite in every way... But an existence that is not received (*irrecepta*) is given in God... because He is Pure Act in every manner of being, devoid of all potentiality and materiality. Therefore such a form is in every way infinite.[34]

It needs to be noted here that John, surreptitiously, jumps from an existence that "*is* not received," *irrecepta*, to one that "*cannot* be received," *irreceptibilis*. An existence that is not received into a potency can be limited, unlimited, or illimitable. If the existence is already *limited*, the Thomist principle of limitation will be superfluous, and of course not serve to prove God's infinity. If the existence is *illimitable*, the principle of limitation will be even more otiose. If the existence is *unlimited but limitable by reception*, many questions arise that would render the principle dubious. If the existence is unlimited, why would there be need to limit it at all? Would it add to the perfection of the

34 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I. disp. 7, artic. unicus, n. 3. Paris: Desclée, 1931. Vol. 1, pp. 547-548: quia existentia si non sit recepta in aliqua natura vel forma qua distinguatur, non habet limitari ratione subiecti recipientis, quia caret illo... ergo si [existentia] est irreceptibilis, debet esse ex omni parte infinita... Sed in Deo datur existentia irrecepta... quia est actus purus in toto genere entis, omni potentialitate et materialitate carens. Ergo talis forma est ex omni parte infinita.

universe to have existence that is limited while it is possible to retain it unlimited? What power could limit unlimited existence, as the power to keep it unlimited would be far greater than the power to limit and restrict it? Furthermore, would not the limitation of something whose nature is to be unlimited be a violence against nature? A universe of violently constituted beings? How would the unlimited-limitable be different from the unlimited-illimitable? If the answer is that the latter has immunity from limitation, which is a perfection, how can the former be said to be unlimited if it lacks that perfection? At any rate the principle in the sense of unlimited-limitable would apply to the creature only and not to God, whose existence is not only not limited or received, but also incapable of being limited or received. For John to show that the unlimited existence is God's, he will have to show that it is not only not *irrecepta* but also *irreceptibilis*. He nowhere proves this, however, but only assumes it to be the case, and so evidently begs the question.

A further objection to John's position is presented by Gabriel Vázquez (1549-1604), one of the many outstanding Baroque Jesuits who is of the same mind as his rival Suárez on this point. Vázquez objects that essence is not distinct from existence, so if essence is not received into anything, neither is existence.[35] Suárez adds that

> in order that a being be finite, it is enough that it be received *from* another being in such and such a measure of perfection, although properly speaking it may not be received *into* any passive potency. And similarly the created essence can be limited by its intrinsic differentia, although it may not be related to existence in the manner of a receptive potency.[36]

3. Redundancy of Thomist principle of limitation

Here Suárez clearly describes two principles of limitation, which are termed the "objective" and the "subjective." In *objective limitation*, an

35 Gabriel Vázquez, *Commentaria et disputationes in Primam Partem Sancti Thomae*, in q. 7, disp. 25, cap. 2.

36 *DM* 30: 2: 19 [26: 70]: Ut ergo esse sit finitum, satis est ut sit receptum ab alio in tanta ac tanta perfectionis mensura, etiamsi proprie non sit receptum in aliqua passiva potentia, et similiter essentia creata potest esse limitata per suam intrinsecam differentiam, etiamsi non comparetur ad esse per modum receptivae potentiae.

entity is limited because, as a caused object, it receives a determinate perfection and no other from its cause; in *subjective limitation*, an unlimited entity is limited by being received into a subject that has a capacity for only so much entitative perfection and no more. John's reply to Vázquez (and Suárez) is significant, for he evidently concedes that the basic tenet of classical Thomism is debatable—a strange admission on the part of the system's major architect:

> To that which Father Vázquez adds, I deny that existence is not distinguished from created essence, as has sufficiently been proved above. However, since this has to do with the opinion of some, and since the infinity of God must not be proved dependently upon any opinion, I add that in the opinion that does not distinguish existence from actual essence, the argument of St. Thomas still holds. Because though existence is entitatively the same as subsistent nature, still, the operation of proceeding from another being through production is dependently realized by the action of that other, and hence accidentally applies to the produced thing—so the latter is received objectively [as a caused object] and participatively, although not subjectively [in a subject]. However, when Being itself is subsistent in such a manner that, neither in its entity nor in the operation of its procession from or production by another, does it possess being that is received, or one that accidentally pertains to it subjectively or objectively—such a being lacks all limitation, because it is in no way received, not even objectively. All this is clear from a sign: as such a being will not have in itself any received operation or accident. Indeed if it will not depend objectively on another for its production, neither will it depend on it for any perfection or operation. Hence by this very fact that a form is existence itself, it is optimally proved to be infinite, because it is not received, either subjectively or objectively—though according to St. Thomas it cannot be maintained that something be received objectively, without it being distinct in essence and received subjectively too.[37]

37 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I. disp. 7, artic. unicus, n. 7. Paris: Desclée, 1931. Vol. 1, p. 549: Ad id quod addit Pater Vazquez negatur existentiam non distingui ab essentia creata, ut superius satis probatum est. Sed quia hoc in opinione aliquorum versatur, et infinitas Dei non debet probari dependenter ab aliqua opinione: addo quod in opinione non distinguente existentiam ab essentia actuali, adhuc urget ratio Divi Thomae: quia licet existentia entitative sit idem cum natura subsistente, tamen illud exercitium procedendi ab alio per productionem, dependenter habet ab actione alterius, et sic accidentaliter convenit ipsi rei productae: et sic est receptum obiective

Suárez formulates the same argument, but more concisely:

> because existence by essence [or what is existent by virtue of its essence] does not have anything which can limit it. But participated being can be limited either by the will of the one who gives it so much perfection and no more, or by the capacity of the recipient, whether that capacity be understood in the manner of a passive potency, or only in the manner of an objective potency, or of non-contradiction. However, in the primal being, which is existent of itself, no principle or rationale of limitation can be understood, because just as it has no cause of its existence, in the same way there can be no limitation to it, either on the part of the giver, or from any other principle.[38]

It would therefore seem to follow that, since, as Suárez contends, the entire system of metaphysics can be deduced from the two postulates of God's entitative independence and the creature's entitative dependence, principles which are beyond debate and admitted as such by the Thomists also, and since the specifically Thomist principle of the limitation of act by potency or of existence by essence is debatable, the principle is superfluous for basing a solid metaphysics and can conceivably be abandoned.

---

et participative, licet non subiective. At vero cum ipsum esse est subsistens taliter quod neque quoad suam entitatem neque quoad suum esse exercitium processionis et productionis ab alio, habet esse receptum, et accidentaliter conveniens tam subiective quam obiective, tale esse caret omni limitatione, quia nullo modo recipitur etiam obiective. Quod patet a signo: quia tale esse non habebit operationem vel aliquod accidens in se receptum. Si enim in suo produci non dependet obiective ab alio, neque in aliqua perfectione vel operatione dependebit. Quare hoc ipso quod forma aliqua est ipsum esse, optime probatur esse infinitum, quia non est esse receptum neque subiective neque obiective: licet apud Divum Thomam non stet aliquod esse recipi obiective, quin etiam sit distinctum ab essentia et recipiatur subiective.

38 *DM* 30: 2: 22 [26: 71]: quia esse per essentiam non habet unde limitetur; esse enim participatum limitari potest, aut ex voluntate dantis tantam perfectionem, et non maiorem, aut ex capacitate recipientis, sive illa capacitas intelligatur per modum passivae potentiae, sive tantum per modum obiectivae, seu non repugnantiae; in primo autem ente, quod ex se est suum esse, nullum principium aut ratio limitationis intelligi potest; quia sicut nullam habet causam sui esse, ita non potest in illo habere limitationem, aut ex parte dantis, aut ex alio principio.

Be that as it may, on another, related, topic, the two Doctors, the Uncommon and the Profound, are unequivocally in agreement—on what constitutes the essence and nature of God, in so far as it can be expressed through imperfect human concepts. Here again we have an important factor in the Suarezianization of Thomism. However, before we examine this topic, it will be interesting to consider the continuation of the process of the Suarezianization of Thomism after the time of John of St. Thomas. At least two Suarezian tenets were assimilated into the Thomist doctrinal corpus, the analogy of attribution and existence as actualized essence.

4. Thomist acceptance of Suarezian analogy

Aquinas does not have clear views on analogy. In at least one instance he opts for the analogy of proportionality, but in subsequent discussions, and generally, he turns to what is known as the "analogy of one to another" (our analogy of attribution) where, of two things, one is relevantly related to the other. Thus being is predicated analogically of substance and accident, because of accident's relationship to substance.[39]

However, Cajetan made the analogy of proportionality orthodox in Thomism till around the mid-20th century. Beginning with Santiago Ramirez (1891-1967)[40] and Étienne Gilson in 1953,[41] many Thomists have rejected the Cajetanian analogy of proportionality and adopted the Suarezian analogy of attribution.[42] A few Thomists, however, moved by their loyalty to Cajetan and Aquinas, sought to combine both analogies into an *analogia mixta*, which however was unknown to the Common Doctor. But John of St. Thomas, as a classical Thomist, remained resolutely attached to the analogy of proportionality.

39 Cf. John F. Wippel, "Metaphysics," in Norman Kretzmann & Eleonore Stump (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*. Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 92.

40 Santiago Ramirez, "En torno a un famoso texto de Santo Tomás sobre la analogía," *Sapientia* 8 (1953), pp, 166-192.

41 Etienne Gilson, "Cajetan et l'éxistence," *Tijdschrift voor Philosophie*, 15 (1953), pp. 267-286.

42 Battista Mondin, "Analogy, Theological Uses of," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967, vol. 1, pp. 465-468. Augustine Thompson, "Francisco Suárez's Theory of Analogy and the Metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Angelicum*, vol. 72, fasc. 3 (1995), pp. 353-362.

Another capitulation was that (of all persons) Gilson himself, that zealous defender of Thomism. Discussing the relation of essence and existence, the French Thomist, apparently denying their real distinction, and practically echoing the words of Suárez, queried: "what is existence, if not essence itself posited in actual reality by the efficacy of some cause?"[43] The Uncommon Doctor describes essence as "that which is constituted within the latitude of real being." What then is existence ? "This very same thing," or essence, declares Suárez, "is conceived under the aspect of existence in so far as it is the reason for existing in the nature of things and outside causes" (*At vero haec eadem res concipitur sub ratione existentiae quatenus est ratio essendi in rerum natura et extra causas*).[44] Essence and existence are not really distinct; existence is existent essence!

Indeed, (though they would never admit it) there seems to be widespread capitulation of Thomists to Suarezianism, according to that fervent guardian of Thomist orthodoxy, Cornelio Fabro, in an article referred to at the beginning of this chapter. One of the capitulators is the Benedictine Joseph Gredt (1863-1940), who claims to describe Act (*actus*) Thomistically, but really in the Suarezian manner, as prescinding from infinity and finitude, and not as positively excluding limitation.[45] The Dominican Roland Gosselin (1883-1934), like Suárez, accepts only one proof of God's existence, from contingence or efficient causality. The Dominican Louis-Bertrand Geiger (1906) rejects the Thomist notion of "participation by composition" (of essence and existence) but accepts instead what he calls "participation by similitude", similitude being the reason, according to Suárez, why God and the creature are both comprehended under the unitary notion of being. The Louvain professor Fernand van Steenberghen (1904-1993) rejects the idea of essence as a kind of phantom waiting for existence to fall from the sky and make it actually real, declaring that, as Suárez would have it, when essence and existence form a

43 Étienne Gilson, *Elements of Christian Philosophy*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co. 1960, p. 118.

44 *DM* 31: 6: 23 [26: 250].

45 Joseph Gredt, "Doctrina thomistica de potentia et actu contra recentes impugnationes vindicatur," *Acta Pontificiae Academiae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, N.S. I, 1934, p. 34: Thomistae non tribuunt actui qua tali positivam infinitatem qua excluderetur limitatio actus, sed negativam tantum… Nihil in se includit quo limitaretur… limitationem tamen non excludit.

unitary composite they are actually real and totally "being". And most Thomists are faulted for distancing themselves from what the zealous Fabro understands the authentic *esse* of Thomas to be. As Gilson himself observes, but in quite another context, "Suarezianism has consumed Thomism."[46]

But being consumed by Suarezianism was only one of Thomism's travails in its quest for identity. Indeed, it was not a stranger to the experience of being consumed by one philosophy or another. It was consumed, for example, in the 17th to 19th centuries by a quasi-Scotist Cajetanism (classical Thomism, Cajetan, 1468-1534), in the first half of the 20th century by Kantianism (Transcendental Thomism, Joseph Maréchal, 1878-1944), in the second half of the 20th by Gilsonism (Existential Thomism, Étienne Gilson, 1884-1978) and at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st by Wittgensteinism (Analytical Thomism, Peter Geach, 1919). But these travails are not directly related to the subject of this book.

V. CONCORD OF THE TWO DOCTORS, ON THE GODHEAD AND THE TRINITY

1. Definition of the divine nature in Suárez and John

Turning now to the topic of the Godhead, or divine nature and its definition. It is usual to find Scholastics, especially Thomists, saying that it is "increate entity" (*entitas increata*) or "subsistent being itself" (*ipsum esse subsistens*). Suárez agrees, but goes on to affirm that in a more precise sense the essence or nature of God is subsistent intellection itself (*ipsamet intellectio subsistens*), which he characterizes as *veluti ultimum essentiale constitutivum divinae naturae*,[47] the ultimate essential constituent, so to speak, of the nature of the Godhead.

The Thomist position is thus stated by Aquinas:

> God's essence is therefore His existence. Now Moses was taught this sublime truth by the Lord... when the Lord showed him that His proper name is "Who Is." Now any name is intended to signify

46 Étienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1949, p. 118.

47 *DM* 30: 15: 15 [26: 174].

> the nature or essence of something. Hence it follows that the divine existence itself is God's essence or nature.[48]

Suárez, however, bases his own view on God's intellectual life, observing that the divine essence is intellectual as subsistent intellection, which is identical with God's knowledge. Hence knowledge by essence is the constitutive form of the divine nature: *scire Dei formalissime constituit et quasi specificat eius essentiam*.; "God's knowledge most formally constitutes and so to speak specified His essence."[49]

2. The Suarezian definition's relevance to Trinitarian problems

This new definition of the divine nature aids Suárez in resolving a problem of crucial importance in Trinitarian theology, one which Eastern Orthodox and many Latin theologians maintain is insoluble.[50] According to this theology the divine nature, by virtue of its unlimited fecundity, needs to communicate itself, since *bonum est diffusivum sui*. Such a communication cannot necessarily be to anything *ad extra*, since, with respect to all that is not God, the divine being is entirely unnecessitated or free. Necessity for God exists only within the latitude of His deity. The communication thus can only be *ad intra*. Communication entails multiplicity, for there has to be at least one communicator and one to whom something is communicated. But communication in God cannot multiply the deity itself, which is a single omniperfect absolute. The communication can thus only be relational, as multiple relations do not impair the unity of an absolute. There are in fact three such (subsistent) relations in the deity, the Persons of the Trinity; one communicator and two communicated relations. Since these communications are those of an intelligential being,

48 Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, lib. 1, cap. 22: Dei igitur essentia est suum esse. Hanc autem sublimem veritatem Moyses a Domino est doctus... ostendens [Dominus] suum proprium nomen esse "Qui est." Quodlibet autem nomen est institutum ad significandum naturam seu essentiam alicuius rei: unde relinquitur quod ipsum divinum esse est sua essentia vel natura.

49 *DM* 30: 15: 15 [26: 174].

50 John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa*, I: 8. *PG* 94: 824A: "We have learnt through faith that there is a difference between begetting and proceeding, but faith tells us nothing about the nature of that difference." See also Adam of St. Victor, *Sequentia XI de S. Trinitate*, *PL* 196: 1459: Quid sit gigni, quid processus, me nescire sum professus.

and as such a being has intellect and will, with the latter consequent on the former, two communications can be postulated, those of the intellect and the will. The former communication expresses itself in the logos, concept or word, and the latter in love.

Scholastic theology calls the process whereby a communication in God is realized a "procession," and declares that the procession of the intellect is the origin of the second Person, the Son, Logos or Word; and that the procession of the will is the origin of the third Person, the Holy Spirit or Love. The entire divine nature is communicated to both Son and Holy Spirit, the communicator of the first procession being the Father, and of the second the Father conjointly with the Son. Since they share the same divine nature as the Father, both Son and Holy Spirit proceed from Him in total similitude. What then differentiates the Son from the Holy Spirit? Why is only the second Person and not the third called a Son: a son being defined as a living being proceeding substantially from another living being in its similitude? This is the problem that Eastern Orthodox theologians declare is a mystery.

Suárez replies that while both the Son and the Holy Spirit do in fact proceed for the Father in the similitude of nature, the intent or formal terminus of the procession of the Son is to communicate the divine nature as nature, and since the divine nature is subsistent intellection, the Son, who is that intellection in its relational or hypostatic mode, is recipient of the similitude to the Father in a formal sense. But the intent or formal terminus of the procession of the Holy Spirit is to communicate, not the divine nature as such, but the divine love of the Father and the Son; hence the Holy Spirit does not by intent proceed in similitude of nature, and is therefore not a Son. Still, since love is identical with nature in God, the divine nature is communicated to the Spirit through its identity with divine love. As Suárez himself states it, the Word alone is produced

> by the power of the Paternal (= of the Father) intellection as such, and not the Holy Spirit. Hence I infer from this, firstly, that the divine essence, by virtue of the procession itself, is communicated to the Word as primarily constituted in the being of such an essence or nature; but that to the Holy Spirit it is not communicated in this way by virtue of the procession, but only in so far as it is included through identity in love.[51]

51 *De sanctissimo Trinitatis mysterio*, lib. 11, cap. 5, n. 16 [1: 789]: ex vi intellectionis paternae, ut sic, et non Spiritus Sanctus. Nam inde imprimis

3. John's harmonization of the Suarezian and Thomist definitions

John entirely agrees with this view, as do other great representatives of Baroque Thomism, the Discalced Carmelite Antonio de la Madre de Dios (1583-1637) of the *Salmanticenses*[52], and the Dominicans-Gonet (1616-1681)[53] and Billuart (1685-1757)[54]. He further clarifies a problem not examined by Suárez: how God's essence or nature can be described as both *ipsum esse subsistens* (or *essentia increata*) and *ipsum intelligere subsistens*. John distinguishes between a transcendent essence and a specific one; both exactly characterize a being, but the latter more precisely than the former. Thus the specific essence of man is "rational animality," which distinguishes him from any other being; but his transcendent essence, which describes him no less exactly, if more broadly, is "created being," though the latter notion is applicable to all other creaturely things also. A similar distinction can be applied to God: *ens increatum* is His transcendent essence and *intellectio subsistens* His quasi-specific one. In John's words:

> Because "being or substance, existent of itself," in so far as it conveys the significance of Pure Act, is found in every attribute or Person, and in all that is divine—no less than "created being," or "being by another," is found in all that is created. Therefore this concept of "being existent of itself" cannot differentiate, in God, what is nature from what is attribute, person, or operation. It only differentiates what is generically divine from what is created, and so distinguishes between transcendent and transcendent, namely between created being as such and uncreated being as such, not between divine nature, as nature, and the [divine] attributes.[55]

---

infero, communicari Verbo ex vi processionis suae divinam essentiam, ut primario constitutam in esse talis essentiae et naturae, Spiritui Sancto autem non ita communicari ex vi processionis, sed quatenus per identitatem in amore includitur.

52 [Antonio de la Madre de Dios,] *Cursus theologicus Salmanticensis*, vol. 1, dis. 4, dub. 2. Palmé edition, vol. 1,pp. 424 sqq.: [divina essentia est] intelligere actuale, per modum actus purissimi—et sub ultima ratione actualitatis per se subsistentis.

53 Jean-Baptiste Gonet, *De Deo Uno*, diss. 1, art. 1.

54 Charles-René Billuart, *De Deo Uno*, diss. 2.

55 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I, disp.16, art. 2, n. 9. Paris: Desclée, 1934. Vol. 2, p. 338: Quia esse a se seu substantia a se, ut dicit ra-

What then constitutes divine nature as such? John of St. Thomas (who is no master stylist) answers with a verbose syllogism. Its main lineaments are as follows:

> *Major*: "that which is the primary and intrinsic principle of a proper operation, and which is primarily applicable to God, has to be the formal constitutive of the divine nature..."
>
> *Minor*: "but the operation proper to God is intellection (*intelligere*)... and it is primary, because the operation of the will presupposes intellection itself, since it is regulated and guided by it..."
>
> *Conclusion*: "therefore it is necessary that the divine nature be formally constituted by... intellection (*intellectualitatem*)."[56]

The major is the definition of nature itself, applied to God. The minor is evident, because the divine intellect is "supremely spiritual and removed from potentiality and imperfection, as is the first [operation], because the operation of the will presupposes intellection, since it is regulated and directed by the latter."[57]

Like Suárez, John maintains that the Son formally proceeds as intellection, "because He proceeds as the similitude of the object known by the intelligence and existing in the same nature, since in God intelligence and being are one and the same." [58] As formally proceeding in

---

tionem actus puri, invenitur in omni attributo et Persona et in omni eo quod divinum est, non minus quam ens creatum, seu ens ab alio, in omni eo quod creatum est; ergo non potest iste conceptus entis a se discernere in Deo id quod natura est, ab eo quod attributum est vel Persona vel operatio: sed solum discernit id quod divinum est in genere, ab eo quod est creatum: et ita distinguit inter transcendens et transcendens, scilicet inter ens creatum ut sic et ens increatum ut sic, non inter naturam divinam, ut natura, et proprietates.

56 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I, disp. 16, art. 2, n. 19. Paris: Desclée, 1934. Vol. 2, p. 341: illud debet esse formale constitutivum naturae divinae, quod est per se principium operationis et per se primo conveniens Deo... sed propria operatio divina est intelligere... ergo oportet quod natura divina constituetur formaliter... per intellectualitatem...

57 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I, disp. 16, art. 2, n. 19. Paris: Desclée, 1934. Vol. 2, p. 341: maxime spiritualis et segregata a potentialitate et imperfectione; et est prima, quia operatio voluntatis supponit ipsum intelligere, siquidem ab eo regulatur et dirigitur.

58 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I, disp. 16, art. 2, n. 14. Paris: Desclée, 1934. Vol. 2, p. 339.

the Father's similitude, He can be properly identified as the Son. As for the Holy Spirit, He

> formally proceeds only according to the communication of impulse and love, though, through identity, He receives the communication of nature also.[59]

To conclude. In describing God more through the notion of intellect that through that of being, our two Scholastics anticipate some modern thinkers, for whom God's essence is "pure understanding";[60] these thinkers reflect modern philosophy's tendency to affirm the primacy of thought over being and to start with knowledge and conclude with being. It must not be forgotten that Suárez and John of St. Thomas were the contemporaries of the father of modern philosophy, Descartes (1596-1650), the Jesuit being 48 years his senior and the Dominican seven. In contrast to modern philosophy, the Scholastic starts with being and concludes with knowledge. According to the two Doctors, the Uncommon and the Profound, God's intellection is not, so to speak, a cognitive nebulosity ungrounded in the primal reality of being, but is the very consummation of God's basic essence as subsistent being; it is, in the words of Suárez, the *ultimum essentiale constitutivum divinae naturae*.

---

59 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus*, I, disp. 16, art. 2, n. 14. Paris: Desclée, 1934. Vol. 2, p. 340: formaliter procedit ut amor qui identificatur cum natura divina et tamen non procedit ut Filius, nec per generationem, quia procedit solum secundum communicationem impulsus et amoris formaliter, identice autem accepit communicationem naturae.

60 "For Lonergan the metaphysical essence of God is not *ipsum esse subsistens*, as Aquinas says, but 'pure understanding,' not *being* but *mind*." J. M. de Torre, "Transcendental Thomism and the Encyclical Veritatis Splendor," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter*, April 1995.

CHAPTER 5
THE IMPACT OF SUÁREZ ON MODERN PHILOSOPHY

INTRODUCTION

I. DESCARTES OR SUÁREZ?

II. MODERN PHILOSOPHERS' KNOWLEDGE OF SUÁREZ
1. Philosophers directly influenced by Suárez
2. Philosophers indirectly influenced by Suárez

III. THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE
1. Skepticism and the Scientific Revolution
2. Scholasticism, Rationalism, Empiricism

IV. SUAREZIAN INTRA-MENTAL THEMES AS GROUNDWORK FOR MODERN PHILOSOPHY
1. Omniconceptualism
2. Intra-mental criteria for extra-mental reality
3. Criteria for certainty
4. Elimination of demonic deception
5. Innate ideas

V. SUAREZIAN EXTRA-MENTAL THEMES AS GROUNDWORK FOR MODERN PHILOSOPHY
1. Types of distinction
2. Substance and modes
3. Disproportion between matter and spirit
4. Individuation
5. Optimal universe

INTRODUCTION

We now leave the relatively tranquil waters of Scholasticism and sail, with the Uncommon Doctor as pilot, into the stormy sea of modern

philosophy. In the Prologue, at the end of Chapter 3 and elsewhere, we suggested that Suárez, in a manner previously unknown to the Scholastics, had made the ascertainment of the truth of extra-mental reality—and indeed the most fundamental truth, that of being itself—dependent on an intra-mental concept: because, he said, the latter was more accessible to us than the former since it was more known to us (*nobis notius*); indeed it was produced by us and in us (*a nobis et in nobis*). Some time later, the "disciple of the disciples of Suárez" was to infer (*ergo*) the truth of an indubitable extra-mental reality "I am" (*sum*), from the better-known (*notior*), indeed self-evident, intra-mental consciousness, expressed as "I think" (*cogito*). [Somewhat later the outstanding philosopher of the 18th century, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), contended that consciousness was the very beginning of all speculative philosophy.] Thus it appears that the little word *notior/notius* was "the minuscule spark that was to ignite the immense conflagration of modern philosophy." This conflagration gutted the Scholastic theory of knowledge (that had kept reason and sensation in balance) and replaced it with a dichotomy of Rationalism and Empiricism, the two doctrines synthesized in the 18th century by Kant. But let us start with the cause of this conflagration, the Uncommon Doctor, Suárez.

Suárez made the fatal move of establishing a subjective state of mind (the formal concept) as the criterion for ascertaining the objective nature of the most basic of metaphysical problems, the problem of "being" (referred to in the objective concept). This decision established, though in one instance only, the preeminence of subjectivity (the intra-mental) over objectivity (extra-mental reality). In addition, it focused on the fact (mentioned above) that in general we know intra-mental concepts better than we do extra-mental reality, the subjective better than the objective, an added reason for concentrating on the subjective in place of the objective. The formal concept of being, which is intra-mental, was elegantly simple, indivisible and unique. Contrariwise the objective concept of being, which is mainly extra-mental, had a heterogeneous, indeed even seemingly confused, character: its reference could be negative (to states like blindness), purely notional (chimera), individual (a man, Peter) and universal (humanity). Later thinkers were not resigned to the heterogeneity of the objective concept; they sought to uniformize its content under the simple rubric of, say, the "knowable"; some of them are known as the "supertranscendental-

ists" (see Chapter 6, below). For the realist Suárez, however, what was known was not the concept itself, but (through the concept) objective reality. The *Eximius* does not appear to have been aware of the danger of making this move toward subjectivism, a move which, through the unwelcome anamorphosis of his thought, was fated to lead to the collapse of metaphysics, in three stages, each with a greater infusion of the subjective than the previous—Cartesian, Kantian and Hegelian. The following is a summary of the process.

Descartes (1596-1650) definitively secured the preeminence of the subjective (the intra-mental) over the objective (extra-mental reality). Indeed, he rooted objectivity in subjectivity, turning objective content into a mere *modus cogitandi*. Objective realities that had immemorially existed by themselves now survived only in relation to self-conscious thought. Now the object of our knowledge was not objective reality (through the concept); it was the concept itself. Self-conscious thought, immune to doubt, became the certain foundation of metaphysics. The thought content could be doubted, but the thinking that occasioned the doubt could not.

By the time of Kant (1724-1804) the preeminence of subjectivity over objectivity was undisputed. Subjectivity now was the basis of the objectivation (through the pure concepts, or categories) of the chaotic sensible data given to the human consciousness in time and space. Subjectivity was now the establisher of objectivity, but not of the objectively real (the notorious and inaccessible thing-in-itself), but only of the objectively apparent phenomena. Finite human subjectivity was the principle of the objectivation of the multiple sense data, but what were objectivized were not the things in themselves, but only as they appeared to the senses.

Hegel (1770-1831) was the creator of the last comprehensive Western metaphysical system. Subjectivity was totally identified with objectivity. This identity was the Absolute, infinite Reason, self-thinking Thought, a substance encompassing all its modes. It was the whole reality, evolving through a process of self-reflection. The Kantian finite subjectivity was replaced by the Hegelian absolute subjectivity, removing the obstacle to the knowledge of the thing-in-itself and to the intimate essence of things.

Hegelianism's collapse was not followed by the creation of rival metaphysical systems, but what may be called anti-metaphysical philosophies, two of which, the philosophies of Schopenhauer and Niet-

zsche, still retained some of the comprehensiveness of their displaced rival. The basic category of Schopenhauer (1788-1860) was a comprehensive will, but a will devoid of conscience, antipodal to Hegelian Reason, a blind driving force no less. So Schopenhauer's thought can be described as *a perversion of metaphysics*. Nietzsche (1844-1900) questioned the very rationale of metaphysics, and found that it could only be justified by being based on man, the lone being for whom metaphysics had been, so to speak, invented. Nietzsche's thought can thus be described as the *inversion of metaphysics*.[1] Be that as it may, the thought of these men, starting with Descartes, and ending with Nietzsche, was in one way or another, affected by that of Suárez.

I. DESCARTES OR SUÁREZ?

It is commonly accepted that, from the time of the Greek thinkers to that of the Scholastics, philosophy's main concern was objective or extra-mental; the philosophy itself could be identified as "realism." But from around the 14th century that concern gradually shifted to the awareness of the intra-mental, an awareness particularly noticeable in the *Magister Incomparabilis* (*Venerabilis Inceptor, Doctor Invincibilis*) William of Ockham (c. 1290- c. 1349); a philosophy with such an awareness would be classified as "idealism." Philosophers became more and more concerned about subjective or mental phenomena (such as concepts, ideas, images and representations), a concern that grew in the 15th century and became dominant from the 16th, due partly to the powerful witness of Descartes. As the focus on the intra-mental continues to preoccupy modern thinking, and as Descartes is taken to be its prime impeller, he has earned the title of "father of modern philosophy." But was he really the originator of the seminal ideas that launched the revolution from the ontic to the noetic? Most historians of philosophy appear to think so. However, a minority of historians seems to believe that the initiator of the modern age of philosophy was in some fashion the Uncommon Doctor himself. The German

1 The saga of the decline and fall of Western metaphysics (but oblivious of Suárez, however) is described in Ingeborg Schüssler, *Hegel et les rescendances de la métaphysique*. Editions Payot Lausanne, 2003, especially pp.203-224. My book owes a great deal to Frederick Copleston's *A History of Philosophy*, published by the Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, particularly to vol. 4, *Descartes to Leibniz*, 1959; vol. 6, *Wolff to Kant*. & vol. 7, *Fichte to Nietzsche*, 1963.

thinker Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) was evidently the first to suggest this, as early as 1927, in lectures given at Marburg, which were published almost 50 years afterwards as *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*.[2] There he declared that "Suárez is the thinker who had the strongest influence on modern philosophy. Descartes is directly dependent on him, using his terminology almost everywhere."[3] A later thinker of like mind went so far as to say that Suárez, "both in his preoccupations and in his methods, was already a distinctively modern philosopher, perhaps more authentically than Descartes the founder of modern philosophy."[4]

How then are "father" and "founder" of modern philosophy connected?

Heidegger attributes it to two factors, systematization and a new classification of metaphysics. In his words:

> It is Suárez who for the first time systematized medieval philosophy and above all ontology. Before him the Middle Ages, including Thomas and Duns Scotus, treated ancient thought only in commentaries, which deal with the texts seriatim. The basic book of antiquity, Aristotle's Metaphysics, is not a coherent work, being without a systematic structure. Suárez saw this and tried to make up for this lack, as he regarded it, by putting the ontological problems in a systematic form for the first time, a form which determined a classification of metaphysics that lasted through the subsequent centuries down to Hegel. In accordance with Suárez' scheme, distinctions were drawn between metaphysica generalis, general ontology, and metaphysica specialis, which included cosmologia rationalis, ontology of nature, psychologia rationalis, ontology of mind, and theologia rationalis, ontology of God. This arrangement of the central philosophical disciplines recurs in Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*.

---

2 We have used Martin Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology. Translation, Introduction, and Lexicon by Albert Hofstadter*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982. Hence Heidegger/Hofstadter, *Phenomenology*. See also Carlos Noreña,"Heidegger on Suárez: the 1927 Marburg Lectures." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 23-4 (92), December 1983, pp. 407-424.

3 Heidegger/Hofstadter *Phenomenology*, p. 80.

4 Alasdair MacIntyre, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990, p. 73.

> Transcendental logic corresponds in its foundations to general ontology.[5]

While there may be agreement on Suárez being the "founder" of modern philosophy, there may be some disagreement as to how precisely his character as founder may be represented. As we noted in Chapter 3, a whole school of interpreting the thought of the Doctor of Coimbra has developed, influenced by the Master of Marburg, which may be called the Heideggerian school of Suarezian exegesis. Its representatives, not all of them Heideggerians, include Pierre Aubenque (1929), Jean-François Courtine (1944), Jean-Luc Marion (1946), Alasdair MacIntyre (1929) and Gustav Siewerth (1903-1963). It is their belief that two ideas are basic both to modernity and to Suarezian Scholasticism —representability and univocity. *Representability* is a concept in philosophy (or ontology) that refers to being insofar as it is knowable, thinkable, representable and intra-mental, not insofar as it is extra-mentally real. A philosophy of this type, it is claimed, is concerned not with existence but with essence. *Univocity* connects with representability, for what is represented connotes a uniform meaning. Beings as disparate as God and the creature are represented under a uniform (or univocal) concept.

As we suggested in Chapter 3, it is difficult to find in this Heideggerian portrait of Suárez the lineaments of the thought of a clear realist philosopher whose preoccupations are wholly and solely ontic, and for whom "existence, as existence, corresponds to being as such." The philosophy of the *Doctor Eximius* would appear to be a labyrinth where the Suarezian Heideggerians have got lost, and are unable to find their way out of it, lacking as they do the Ariadne thread of the Doctor's unequivocal realism. Straying deeper into the gloom of the labyrinth, they run into the fearsome Heideggerian Minotaur. It is our contention that, while Suárez is the consummator of Scholasticism, he is also (as anamorphosed) the unwitting founder of modern philosophy.

II. MODERN PHILOSOPHERS' KNOWLEDGE OF SUÁREZ

Who were the philosophers that Suárez influenced, and how much did they know about him? The following 10 thinkers, continental

5 Heidegger/Hofstadter, *Phenomenology*, p. 80.

rationalists and British empiricists, were affected by the thought of Suárez in one fashion or another:

1. Philosophers directly influenced by Suárez

1. Descartes

René Descartes (1596-1650) described as the "disciple of the disciples of Suárez," was borne in Touraine in western France on March 31, 1596. In 1604 he was sent to the Jesuit school of La Flèche at Anjou, where he studied until 1612. There three years were devoted to philosophy: in the first year to logic, based on the texts of the Jesuits Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599) and Francisco de Toledo (1532-1596); in the second year, to natural philosophy, with Aristotle as the guide; and in the third year to metaphysics and moral philosophy, as formulated by the Conimbricenses and Suárez. In his writings[6] Descartes quotes Suárez once, when there was doubt whether the phrase "material falsity" he had employed was used by other philosophers too, he discovered that it had been used by Suárez.[7] Descartes was here replying to objections by the Jansenist theologian Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694): he refers to Suárez's *Disputationes* as a book he had close at hand. Descartes was bewildered and confused by the variety of the views of his predecessors that Suárez had depicted in great detail: it inspired him to make a radical new start where all confusion would be avoided. Alas, in eliminating the moderate confusion of Scholastic philosophy catalogued by Suárez, Descartes only precipitated the overwhelming confusion of modern philosophy (or philosophies), which even Suárez could not have reduced to order! After leaving La

6 Our quotations from Descartes are based on *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff & Donald Murdoch. Cambridge University Press 1985, 2 vol. Abbreviated to *CSM*. Some quotations are taken from Charles Adam & Paul Tannery, *Oeuvres de Descartes*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1897-1913. 13 vols. Abbreviated to *AT*.

7 Descartes, "Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections," *CSM* vol. II, p. 164: "since I have never spent very much time reading philosophical texts, my calling ideas which I take to provide subject-matter for error 'materially false' might have involved too great a departure from standard philosophical usage. This might, I say, have worried me, had I not found the word 'materially' used in an identical sense to my own in the first philosophical author I came across, namely Suárez, in the *Metaphysical Disputations*, Part IX, Section 2, Number 4."

Flèche Descartes studied at the university of Poitiers (1614-1616), and served in the army of Maurice of Nassau (1618-1619). In 1619 he had three dreams that convinced him that his mission was to seek philosophical truth by reason. He visited Italy (1623-1625), and on his return to France he met and favorably impressed the renowned Oratorian mystic, Pierre de Bérulle (1575-1629). Most of what remained of his life was spent between France and Holland. Queen Christina (1626-1689) invited him to Sweden in 1649 to be her instructor in philosophy, but the climate there was his undoing. He died of pneumonia on February 11, 1650. He never married but fathered a daughter in 1635.

2. Hobbes

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) appears to be the first British philosopher who in his writings shows an awareness of the thought of Suárez.[8] He mentions the *Doctor Eximius* twice, once in *Leviathan* (1651) and once in *Behemoth* (written c. 1660-1668). Other thinkers who influenced Hobbes are Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), William Harvey (1578-1657) Marin Mersenne (1588-1648) and Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655).

In *Leviathan* he actually quotes a minor work of Suárez, *De concursu, motione et auxilio Dei*, liber 1, caput 6, which he presents as an example of Scholastic gibberish, though Hobbes himself uses Scholastic terms like inherent form, quality inherent, active and passive potency, and the like. His definition of liberty shows an awareness of that of Suárez, which is as follows: *potentiam liberam esse, quae positis omnibus requisitis ad agendum, potest agere et non agere* "the faculty is free, which when all the requisites for acting are posited, can act or not act.".[9] In Hobbes's rendition, "Hence appears the definition of a Free Agent to be that which, all things requisite to work being put, may work, or not work, implies a contradiction."[10] Hobbes's own philosophy was Mechanism, the theory that everything in the universe is produced

8 Bartomeu Forteza, "La influencia de Francisco Suárez sobre Thomas Hobbes," *Convivium* 11 (1998), pp. 40-79.

9 *De concursu, motione et auxilio Dei*, lib. 1, cap. 3, n. 2 [11: 14]: "that the faculty is free, when all things that are requisite for activity are in place, it can or can not act."

10 Hobbes, *Short Tract* [1630-1631], sec. 1, concl. 11. Spelling modernized.

by matter in motion. He sought to demonstrate this theory by the geometrical method, the only method in his belief capable of freeing the sciences from uncertainty. He agreed with Suárez that the power of the sovereign derived originally from the people, and that monarchy was the most efficient form of sovereignty. His political philosophy was developed in the writings of other political theorists, Locke (1632-1704), Spinoza (1632-1677) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778).

3. Glisson

Next, is the enigmatic figure of the British Scholastic Francis Glisson (1597-1677), evidently the only British philosopher who can be considered a Suarezian, though by no means a faithful one.[11] Glisson himself confessed that Suárez was his guide (*dux*) but not master (*magister*). Glisson was a physician, and through physics was inspired to become a metaphysician, preoccupied (as was Suárez) with the problem of the individual, a problem treated by the Uncommon Doctor on the theological, metaphysical and epistemological planes. The medical science cannot afford the luxury of reified universals, for medicine treats each patient as a singularity. Simply put: medicine is a science of the individual. Each patient is an individual, with an individual's problems. The physician must study the character of the patient, the uniqueness of his biography, and the combination of circumstances affecting his life.

Glisson was a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians in London, a prominent member of the Royal Society and professor of "physic" at Cambridge, where he lectured on anatomy. He died in 1677, 5 years after the publication of the book by which he is best known, the *Tractatus de natura substantiae energetica, seu de vita naturae eiusque tribus facultatibus (perceptiva, appetitiva, motiva) et naturalibus, etc.* [*Treatise of the Nature of Energetic Substance, or of the Life of Nature and its Three Faculties (Perceptive, Appetitive, Motive)*], London, 1672.

Having focused on the singular, Glisson declares that the singular is existence devoid of essence. Essence responds to the question, "*What* is it?" (*quid est?*: hence "quiddity"). But existence is concerned with the

11 Adelino Cardoso, "A viragem glissoniana do pensamento de Francisco Suárez," in Adelino Cardoso *et al.*, *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Tradição e modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 207-222.

fact *that* a thing is (*quod est*: hence Glisson's neologism "quoddity"). Quoddity contains the full intelligible content of being (*totam entis rationem absolvit… ipsaque quidditas eiusdem consistit in eo quod est*).

The act of existence is found in its perfection in substance, and the essence of substance in subsistence. Subsistence for Glisson is not just a mode, as Suárez would have it, but the fundamental essence of substantial nature (*fundamentalis essentia naturae substantialis*). In fact, substance and subsistence are identical. Subsistence separates each being from all other beings. Each such being experiences itself in self-perception—a perception that manifests that substance's energetic nature insofar as it is the source of inspiration, exercising itself in the different levels of life, including the most elementary ones. The goal of this substance is self-fruition—*naturae substantialis fruitio sui*.

4. Malebranche

Nicolas de Malebranche (1638-1715) was a priest of the Oratorian order, an order founded in Italy in 1575 and established in France in 1613. Before Malebranche entered the Oratorians in 1660 he studied Scholastic philosophy at the Collège de la Marche in Paris (1654-1656), and Scholastic theology at the Sorbonne (1656-1659). On becoming an Oratorian, he pursued his theological studies at the Oratory (1661-1659), where his order was housed. In 1664 he converted to Cartesianism, and became one of its chief exponents, though a controversial one. He was devoted to Augustine (354-430), the foremost of the Latin Church Fathers, a theologian highly esteemed by the Oratory, who believed that we know eternal truths through divine illumination. Malebranche professed to despise Scholasticism, a philosophy that began with sense experience, explained knowledge by abstraction, invented a cumbersome ontology, and created imaginary entities, he said, like qualities, faculties and substantial forms. Yet he was greatly influenced by Scholastic thought, for both he and the Scholastics had a problem in common: how to explain an immaterial being's (angel's and human soul's) knowledge of the material world, given the total disproportion of matter and spirit. The Scholastics he was acquainted with were Aquinas (1224-1274), Scotus (1265-1308) and Suárez, particularly the latter, whom he mentions by name at least once (*Ecclaircissements* 15, first sentence). Suárez had written at great length on the knowledge of immaterial spirits in his *De angelis*, a book with which Malebranche appears to have been familiar. But

our Oratorian also read at least two other of Suárez's works, a minor treatise, *De concursu et efficaci auxilio Dei ad actus liberi arbitrii necessario*, and the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, disputes 18 and 22, both of which deal with the problem of causality, secondary and primary.[12] Malebranche denied any causal efficacy to creatures, contending that God was the sole cause of all that the creatures did. He was therefore anxious to refute Suárez's defense of secondary causality.

5. Leibniz

Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716), philosopher and mathematician, studied mathematics at Jena (1663), and earned a doctorate in law at Altdorf (1666). He was a diplomat in the service of the elector of Mainz (1666-1673), a privy councilor of the Duke of Brunswig-Lüneberg (1676) and librarian at Wolfenbüttel (1691). In 1700 he founded the Society of Scientists in Berlin, later the Prussian Academy, and became its first president.

Leibniz is the first great German philosopher of modern times; his scholarship embraced the physical sciences, history and law. He is the founder of symbolic logic, and, independently of Newton, the developer of infinitesimal calculus. His philosophical works include *Nouveaux Essais sur l'Entendement Humain* (1704), a critique of Locke's empiricism; *Essais de Théodicée sur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'Homme, et l'Origine du Mal* (1710), containing the argument that the present universe is the optimal one; and *Monadology* (1714), a defense of the theory that the ultimate constituents of the universe are simple immaterial substances.

Leibniz claims that while still a boy, he had read Suárez as one reads a novel.[13] He quotes the *Eximius* at least four times, once from the latter's *De sacramentis* (vol. 2, disp. 65, sect. 1 [21: 442-446]) on the adoration of Christ in the sacrament, and thrice from the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*: on the individual (5: 2: 16 [25: 153]); on the definition of cause (no reference given, but it is to *DM* 12: 2: 4 [25: 384]); and an

12 *DM* 18 [25: 592-687]: De causa proxima efficiente, eiusque causalitate, et omnibus quae ad causandum requirit. *DM* 22 [25: 802-843]: De prima causa efficiente et altera eius actione, quae est conservatio.

13 André Robinet, "Suárez dans l'oeuvre de Leibniz," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 7 (1980), pp. 191-209. Cf. Pierre Mesnard, "Comment Leibniz se trouva placé dans le sillage de Suárez," *Archives de Philosophie* 18-1 (1949), pp. 7-32.

unnamed theologian (no other than Suárez) who rejects the theory, so favored by Leibniz, of the present universe being the optimal one, with its perfect species. The words of Suárez quoted in Leibniz's *Essaies de Théodicée* are those of *DM* 30: 17: 20 [26: 212]. They are to the effect that there is no species "that is more perfect than all others. Nor is this an unwelcome conclusion," declares the adversary, "since there is no such thing," *nullam [speciem] cognoscit perfectiorem caeteris omnibus; neque id est inconveniens, quia nulla est.*

6. Vico

Giambattista Vico (1668-1774), Italian philosopher and historian, regarded by many as the first modern historian, the first to formulate a systematic method of historical research. Vico viewed history as not just biographies of great men, or the working out of God's will, but as an account of the birth and development of human societies and their institutions. His major themes were developed in his *Scienza Nuova* (1725, 1730, 1744).

Of all the philosophers mentioned in this chapter, Vico seems to be the one who studied Suárez with great thoroughness.[14] Earlier he had pored over the works of the logician Peter of Spain (1226-1276) and the philosopher Duns Scotus (1265-1308). Our avid student had "heard that Father Suárez in his *Metaphysics* discussed everything that could be known in philosophy in a distinguished manner as becomes a metaphysician, and in an extremely clear and easy style, as in fact he stands out by his incomparable eloquence. So again he left school, to better purpose than before, and retired to his home for a year to study Suárez." However, history interested Vico more than metaphysics, and the impact of Suárez on his thought is hard to discern, except perhaps on the supreme importance of the singular and individual, for history is an account of events that are unique and preeminently individual. It is claimed that Vico was influenced by Suárez's analysis of the three

14 Giambattista Vico, *Autobiografia. Seguita da una scelta di lettere, orazioni e rime a cura di Mario Fubini*. Einaudi editore, 1960, p. 7: Ma, ad esso lui sembrando il Ricci troppo essersi trattenuto nella spiegazione dell'ente e della sostanza per quanto si distingue per gli gradi metafisici, perché gli era avido di nuove cognizioni; ed avendo udito che'l padre Suárez nella sua *Metafisica* ragionava di tutto lo scibile in filosofia con una maniera eminente, come a metafisico si conviene, e con uno stilo sommamente chiaro e facile, come infatti egli vi spicca con una incomparabil facondia; lasciò la scuola con miglior uso che l'altra volta, e si chiuse un anno in casa a studiare sul Suárez.

transcendental attributes of being (unity, truth and goodness, *DM* disputations 3-10), and that the so-called Vichian formula, the central theme of Vico's system, his criterion of the truth, that "the true is the made"—*Verum ipsum factum*—bears the imprint of Suarezian ideas, for what is made is ineluctably singular.[15]

7. Wolff

Christian Wolff (1679-1754), a renowned representative of the *Aufklärung*, sought to restructure Leibnizian philosophy on the Scholastic model. He gave experience a greater importance than did the Rationalists; for him (as for the Scholastics) philosophy was a marriage of reason and experience (*connubium rationis et experientiae*). Wolffian ontology was an analysis of logical possibilities for the existence of real entities. Wolff was uncomfortable with some of Leibniz's cherished ideas, such as that of monads and of the inclusion of predicates in their subjects. Wolff was professor at Halle and Marburg, and later chancellor at Halle. He was one of the first German philosophers to write in his native language instead of Latin. His philosophy became the dominant force in German universities after 1720. His most famous work is *Vernûnftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt, und der Seele der Menschen/Rational Ideas of God, the World and the Soul of Man* (1719).

Wolff set out to organize all human knowledge in his *Philosophia prima, sive Ontologia, methodo scientifico pertractata, qua omnis cognitionis humanae principia continentur* (1736). In this book Suárez is quoted twice, including the following memorable passage where he refers to the *Disputationes Metaphysica*: "To be sure Francisco Suárez of the Society of Jesus, who among the Scholastics appears to have meditated more profoundly the objects of metaphysics, in the *Metaphysical Disputes*, tom. 1, disp. 2, sect. 4 & 5… says that the essence of a thing is that which is the first, radical and intimate principle of all actions and properties which belong to that thing."[16]

15 Elio Gianturco, "Suárez and Vico. A Note on the Origin of the Vichian Formula," *Harvard Theological Review* 27-3 (1934), pp. 207-210.

16 Christian Wolff, *Philosophia prima, sive Ontologia methodo scientifica petractata, qua omnis cognitionis humanae principia continentur (1736), Pars I, sect II, cap. III*. De notione entis: Sane Franciscus Suárez e Societate Jesu, quem inter Scholasticos res metaphysicas profundius meditatum esse constat, in *Disputationibus Metaphysicis*, tom 1, disp. 2, sect. 5 & 5, f. 57, essen-

8. Berkeley

George Berkeley (1685-1753) was an Irish philosopher who held that all reality is reducible to human thought. His major works include the *Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* (1710), *Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous* (1713) and *Alciphron, or, the Minute Philosopher* (1732).[17] Berkeley had some knowledge of the writings of Suárez, and was acquainted with men who were familiar with those writings, like Leibniz, as well as others affected by the Iberian master's thought, like Spinoza and Locke. Berkeley, as was usual in his time, speaks of Scholasticism unfavorably,[18] but, what was less usual, has good things to say about the Schoolmen,[19] stressing in particular the urbanity of their discussions. Berkeley quotes Suárez at least once, on the matter of analogy.[20]

Berkeley agrees with Suárez on the following themes: analogy, nominalism, and the distinction between existence and subsistence. Speaking of God and His attributes, Berkeley refers to the views of Scholastics on the subject, two of them mentioned by name, Aquinas and Suárez. Berkeley, apparently referring to the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* 30: 15: 2 [26: 170], distinguishes between the formal sense of these attributes, which can apply to God, and some imperfections that these attributes are liable to have and which do not belong to the formal sense, being found only in the creatures.

9. Schopenhauer

Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), German philosopher and psychologist, developer of a celebrated philosophy of pessimism, opponent of Hegel (1770-1831) and influencer of Nietzsche (1844-

---

tiam rei id esse dicit, quod est primum et radicale et intimum principium omnium actionum et proprietatum, quae rei conveniunt, p. 138 [*DM* 2: 4 & 5].

17 Works of Berkeley are quoted from Alexander Campbell FRASER (ed.), *The Works of George Berkeley*, etc., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901, 4 vol.

18 Berkeley,, *Alciphron*, dialogue 5, n. 24, vol. 2, p. 224; *Principles of Human Knowledge*, n. 17, vol. 1, p. 249.

19 Berkeley, *Alciphron*, dialogue 5, n. 19, vol. 2, p. 215; *Commonplace Book* (1871).

20 Berkeley, *Alciphron*, dialogue 4, n. 20, vol. 2, p. 185.

1900). He considered himself as the successor of Kant (1724-1804), and interpreted the latter's unknowable thing-in-itself as a blind, impelling force that is manifest in individuals as will to live.

Schopenhauer quotes Suárez at least 6 times: *DM* 3: 3: 3 (*De passionibus entis* [25: 108]); *DM* 5: 3 (*De unitate individuali* [25: 161-175]); *DM* 15: 1 (*De causa formali substantiali* [25: 498-505]); and *DM* 25: 1 (*De causa exemplari* [25: 899-910]). Among Schopenhauer's works are *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* (1819), *Parerga und Paralipomena* (1851). *DM* is quoted thrice in the former, and once in the latter.

10. Brentano

Franz Brentano (1838-1917), was a German philosopher, psychologist, and ex-priest, professor of philosophy in Vienna. His best-known book, *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte* (1874) attempts to establish psychology as an independent discipline. Brentano influenced many thinkers, including Edmund Husserl (1858-1938), founder of the phenomenological movement, and Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), whose interest in Scholastic philosophy was doubtless derived in part from conversations with his mentor.

Brentano recommended the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* to anyone desiring to learn of the diversity of medieval views on Aristotle, who was for him the outstanding philosopher. Brentano was no Suarezian. Like some of his contemporaries, the German ex-priest may have learned some of his philosophy in Suárez, not from Suárez. Like his mentor, Brentano's pupil Heidegger was interested in Suárez not as a thinker in his own right, but as a transmitter of ancient Greek ontology to modern philosophy.[21]

2. Philosophers indirectly influenced by Suárez

We have no hard evidence that the following six thinkers knew of the Uncommon Doctor or his writings, but some features of their thought that echo his own suggest that his ideas, in unknown ways, permeated their thinking.

21 Franz Brentano, *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung nach Aristoteles* (1852).

1. Spinoza

Baruch or Benedict Spinoza (Portuguese Bento Espinosa, 1632-1677), a Jew of Portuguese descent who was born and lived in Holland. His independence of mind led him to be excommunicated by the Jewish authorities in 1656. Spinoza may have known of Suárez, and the Christian philosophers of the Baroque, but he was neither a voracious reader nor an erudite writer. The name of Suárez never appears in his writings, and there is no reference to even Plato and Aristotle in his most important work, *Ethics*. The authors he was familiar with are Descartes, Bacon, Hobbes, Maimonides, Crescas and Heereboord. The Scholastic vocabulary, elaborated by Suárez, reached him through the Latin works of Descartes, and by the Suarezian compendia or manuals, used in the Dutch universities of the early 17th century. (Spinoza lived near Leiden, and was in touch with the faculty of its university.) Some of these manualists are the following, mentioned with their manuals: Gilbert Zacchaeus (1578-1628), *Primae philosophiae institutiones*, a summary of the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*; Franco Burgerdijck (1590-1629), *Institutiones metaphysicae* (influence of Suárez modified by Calvinist theological ideas); the Lutheran Jacob Martini (1570-1649) *Exercitationes theorematum metaphysicorum* (1604); and the Calvinist Clemens Timpler (1567-1624), *Metaphysicae systema methodicum*.

However, there is more than meets the eye. Scholars are divided on the question as to whether Spinoza had a good knowledge of contemporary Scholasticism, given that he shows no awareness of any text of the age's prime Scholastic, Suárez. But there are tell-tale sentences that reveal more than Spinoza might have liked. One such Scholastic was the Suarezian Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza (1578-1651), author of *Universa Philosophia* (1624), and one of the outstanding metaphysicians of the time, second only to Suárez and perhaps to Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599). In the *Universa Philosophia* Hurtado is discussing the crucial distinction between essence and existence, in the course of which he expresses his frustration at the carping of some "obscure philosophers who give us a long disputation interwoven with a thousand difficulties, *searching for a knotty point in the text*, and under the pretext of cleverness, they darken the things which shine a light

from nature itself."[22] Spinoza, discussing the concepts of truth and falsehood, expresses his vexation at some of his own carpers (borrowing a phrase from Hurtado, saying that "now there remains nothing to be noted, even what we have said if writers had not so tied themselves up in trifles like these that they could not then extricate themselves, always *looking for a difficulty where there is none*.[23]

2. Locke

John Locke (1632-1704) is considered by some scholars to be the greatest English philosopher and the founder of British empiricism, though intermixed with rationalist elements. Like Glisson, he was also a physician. He never quotes Suárez or refers to his ideas. However, during his stay in Holland (from 1683 to 1689), Locke came in contact (as did his contemporary Spinoza), with the philosophers of the university of Leiden, men who were familiar with the thought of the *Doctor Eximius*. One of these philosophers was Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), a great admirer of Suárez (considering him to be a man "of such subtlety in philosophy that he hardly had any equal")[24]; Locke looked up to Grotius as his foremost teacher in politics and all its philosophical and theological connotations. Another Suárez admirer who influenced Locke was the jurist Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694), one of the forerunners of the German Enlightenment.[25]

---

22 Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza, *Universa philosophia*, cap. 2:…de quibus longam, et mille difficultatibus plexam disputationem nobis dant obscuri philosophi, *nodum in scripto quaerentes*, et ingenii specie, obtenebrantes ea quibus ab ipsa natura lumen affulget. *Universa philosophia*, cap. 2.

23 Spinoza, in René Descartes, *The Principles of Philosophy Demonstrated in the Geometric Manner by* Benedict de Spinoza. To which are added his *Metaphysical Thoughts*. Appendix Containing Metaphysical Thoughts, Part 1, chapter 6, Shirley ed. p. 187. See Piero di Vona's erudite *Studi sulla scolastica della Controriforma. L'esistenza e la sua distinzione metafisica dall'essenza*, Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1968, pp. 296-297.

24 Hugo Grotius, Letter to Canon John Cordesius, 15 October 1633. *Epistolae quotquot reperiri potuerant*, Amsterdam 1687, p. 118: in philosophia… tantae subtilitatis, ut vix quemquam habeat parem.

25 Jaime Brufau Prats, "Influencia de Suárez en la Ilustración," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 7(1980), pp. 65-79. Discusses the influence of Suárez on the jurist and forerunner of the Aufklärung, Samuel Pufendorf.

3. Hume

David Hume (1711-1776), a Scottish philosopher and historian, pressed the analysis of Locke and Berkeley to the logical extreme of skepticism. Hume shows no knowledge of Suárez, but he demolished, on empirical principles, categories of thought like causality, that had seen the imprint of Suarezian thinking.

4. Kant

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), the greatest philosopher of the late 18th century, seems to have had no knowledge whatever of Suárez, but was aware of the writings of men like Wolff, who were familiar with the Uncommon Doctor's thought. Kant's knowledge of Scholasticism was scant. According to him it consisted of nothing but commentaries on Aristotle, with the commentators indulging, like the Greek master, in speculative reason, and dealing only with subtleties in logic and metaphysics.

5. Hegel

Georg Wilhelm Hegel (1770-1831) shows no awareness of Suárez's work but deals with some topics using vocabulary that seems to reflect the great Baroque Scholastic's thought.

6. Nietzsche

Any awareness that Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900) may have had of Suárez was through the work of Schopenhauer.

Whatever one may think of these and other philosophers, it does seem clear that Suárez laid the foundations of modern philosophy (or philosophies) by endowing metaphysics, for the first time, with the systematic structure in which the themes and problems of ontology were classified with a rigorous logic: this was in sharp contrast to the previous unmethodical organization of Aristotle's book of metaphysics, the basis of the teaching of that discipline for a millennium. Suárez also provided some ideas that were basic to his system, but, which, anamorphosed, became the groundwork of the modern systems of philosophy.

III. THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

1. Skepticism and the Scientific Revolution

At the beginning of this Chapter we referred to the little word *notior/notius* as "the minuscule spark that was to ignite the immense conflagration of modern philosophy." (See Chapter 3, above.) What caused the spark to ignite in the 16th century was the ubiquitous tinder of skepticism, represented by Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592),[26] master of French prose, but other thinkers like Francisco Sanches (1550-1623)[27]. Montaigne, the eminent French skeptic, who greatly influenced English literature, discoursed in elegant and persuasive language on topics like human fallibility, the relativity and unreliable character of sense-experience; the mind's dependence on this experience, its consequent incapacity for attaining absolute truth; as well as its inability to resolve the conflicting claims of the senses and reason.

This skepticism was inimical not only to the Christian faith but also to Scholastic philosophy. Besides, it was hostile to the Scientific Revolution, whose rumblings had been heard in medieval times, but which detonated only in the Renaissance.

The principles of the Revolution conformed to the basic Scholastic tenet that human knowledge begins with the senses. As Suárez puts it, "human knowledge begins with the senses, hence it is through the senses that it achieves clarity and certitude. So to the extent that knowledge is remote from the senses, to that extent will it be less certain" (*humana cognitio a sensu incipit, unde per sensum accipit claritatem et certitudinem; quo ergo fuerit cognitio de rebus a sensu remotior, eo erit minus certa).*[28] For the votaries of the Revolution, as for Aristotle, scientific inquiry was a two-stage progression from observation to general principles, and back to observations, which could suggest a general idea that unified what those observations disclosed. In addition, the revolutionaries promoted the use of mathematics, to test the observations; they also emphasized the importance of experiment—an act or operation engaged in to test a principle or to discover something unknown. If the observations warranted, the idea could be developed

26 Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592), *Essais* (1571-1580); includes Apology for Raimond Sebond.

27 Francisco Sanches, *Quod nihil scitur* (That Nothing is Known, 1581).

28 *DM* 1: 5: 22 [25: 43].

into a hypothesis. If experiments and reasoning did not match, the hypothesis was discarded; if they did match, the hypothesis became a theory, and could eventually become a law.

From this viewpoint of the Scientific Revolution, therefore, the position of the Aristotelians was deficient on several counts, like the use of experiment, the collection of data, and the appeal to Aristotle's authority. The Aristotelians discouraged experiment, on the plea that the alteration of natural conditions required in the operation was unnatural. Their collection of data was haphazard and uncritical; and canonical authority was conferred on the Aristotelian canon, much of whose content had been based on observation in its time, but which further observations had rendered obsolete.

The harbinger of this method was the remarkable medieval friar, Roger Bacon (c. 1210-1292). But the Scientific Revolution was really initiated in the Renaissance, by the great Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), inventor of machines and researcher into geology, geography, and astronomy, and what was for him the ultimate machine, the human body; and by Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), the astronomer, whose book, *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (1543), finally launched the Revolution whose consequences were greater than any other intellectual event in the history of mankind. This revolution was given its philosophical basis by Francis Bacon (1561-1626), who laid particular emphasis on experiment. But what could make science immune to the assaults of skepticism was the one human system of knowledge—mathematics—which could assure both certainty and the indefinite progress of science. The central importance of mathematics in the Scientific Revolution was assured by Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), who declared that Nature is mathematical in structure, that God has written the book of the universe in the language of mathematics. In consequence of this tenet, Galileo gave a mathematical formulation to a number of physical laws. What Copernicus began climaxed in the work of Isaac Newton (1642-1727), formulated in his epoch-making *Naturalis philosophiae principia mathematica* (1687).

To come back to the confrontation of skepticism and the Scientific Revolution. It is no wonder then that skepticism's chief opponent, Descartes, himself a creative mathematician (inventor of an important connection between geometry and mathematics, which made the quick mathematization of physics possible), should decide to employ the mathematical method to defeat skepticism. But victory against

skepticism could not be assured by mathematics alone, as it dealt only with ideas and not (as did skepticism) with existential facts. To strike at the heart of skepticism, there would be need for a combination of the irrefutable mathematical method with an irrefutably existent fact. That fact could be found (if need be) in the doubting skeptic himself! For no matter what the inveterate doubter doubted, he could not doubt that he doubted. The doubt expressed in his thought confirmed his undoubtable existence: Descartes gave this thought the formula "I think, therefore I am." The realization of this truth would lead to further certainties, as to the discovery of the criterion of certitude—clear and distinct ideas. This criterion would in its turn be confirmed by establishing the existence of God, a being greater than whom none existed, one incapable of falsehood and deception. Recourse to the fallible senses was avoided, for the mind of man (it was alleged) like that of an angel, was endowed with a divinely confirmed innate knowledge of the external world: the application of the mathematical method to the innate ideas embodying this knowledge would give it proper form. Modern philosophy thus begins with what has been described as Descartes's *angelism*.

2. Scholasticism, Rationalism, Empiricism

The Scholastics, however, were under no illusion that man was less than an angel, and that his mode of knowing, through discourse, was far inferior to the angel's intuitive cognition. As the Carmelite Thomist Antonio de la Madre de Dios (1583-1637) put it, "knowledge through discourse is far removed in immateriality from any angel's manner of knowing, which is sufficiently actual [as opposed to the human, which is 'potential'], since it pertains to the supreme grade of created immateriality; together with the fact that knowledge through discourse properly speaking is the most imperfect among all the intellectual ones, as exposing the humbler grade of immateriality among the intellectual grades."[29] This humble discursive mode of cognition

29 [Antonio de la Madre de dios], *Cursus theologicus Salmanticensis*, *De angelis*, disp. 8, dub. 2, sect. 3, n. 38. Quia cognitio per discursum valde distat in immaterialitate a modo cognoscendi cuiuslibet angeli, qui est satis actualis, quippe pertinens ad supremum gradum immaterialitatis creatum: cum tamen cognitio per discursum proprie dictum sit modus cognoscendi imperfectissimus inter omnes intellectuales, seu arguens ignobiliorem gradum immaterialitatis inter gradus intellectuals.

produced the baffling complexities of Scholasticism that so excited the ire and frustration of Descartes, and indeed of so many others, including that renowned representative of the Spanish Enlightenment, Benito Geronimo Feijóo (1676-1764). For the illustrious Benedictine, the jargon of Scholasticism was a disparity, noted, for instance in the contrast between the simplicity of God and of the abstruseness of our knowledge of Him. " God, who is the object of theology," said Feijóo, is

> most simple, who in one indivisible entity contains all possible perfections, that no one, who would not be well instructed in all the logical and metaphysical abstractions, could acquire that knowledge of God which Scholastic theology produces, distinguishing essence, attributes, formal and eminential predicates, etc. In the same manner, without understanding the notions of nature, suppositum, existence, relation, and many others that they teach in the Arts courses, could one take a single step in the treatises on the most holy mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation. Nor could one—without knowing what was substance, accident, habit, operative power etc.—attain in any way the information and efficient causality of the supernatural beings. In general there is hardly any theological material which is not a [dark and dangerous] Norway to one who does not carry in front the lights of dialectics, physics, metaphysics and psychology which they teach in the Schools.[30]

However, humble or not, our human manner of knowing is our manner of knowing, the Scholastics believed, and therefore merits our examination of it, which can be set forth as follows.

30 Benito Geronimo Feijóo, *Apologia de Scepticismo Medico. Ilustración Apologética*, 1727, p. 219: consiste, en que siendo Dios, que es objeto de la teología, simplicísimo, que en una indivisible entidad contiene todas las perfecciones posibles, no puede adquirir aquel conocimiento de Dios que produce la Teología Escolástica, distinguiendo esencia, atributos, predicados formales y eminenciales, &c, quien no estuviere bien instruído en todas las abstracciones lógicas y metafísicas. Asimismo sin entender bien las nociones de naturaleza, supuesto, existencia, relación, y otras muchas que se enseñan en los cursos de Artes, no se podrá dar un paso en los tratados de los sacrosantos misterios de Trinidad, y Encarnación. Ni sin saber qué es substancia, accidente, hábito, virtud operativa, &c, se podrá alcanzar en algun modo la esencia, información, y causalidad eficiente de los entes sobrenaturales. Generalmente apenas hay materia teológica que no sea una Noruega para quien no lleva delante las luces de la dialéctica, íisica, metafísica, y animástica que se enseñan en las Escuelas.

For Suárez, as for the Scholastics in general, all being is within the purview of the human intellect; it includes supersensible beings like God and souls. "Whatever has any entity can be known by our intellect," declares Suárez, for "our intellect knows God, angels and material things, as well as their accidents and essence." Indeed, "intelligible and intellect respond mutually and match equally; but whatever has entity is intelligible: therefore our intellect can know it in some way."[31]

Scholastics contend that the human intellect has two objects, adequate and proportionate. It has sufficient powers to realize its *adequate* or total object, which is "being in its entire latitude... the adequate object encompasses all the things with which the faculty can concern itself; but the intellect can know whatever has the note of being; therefore that will be its total object."[32]

While the adequate object includes transcendent beings with which the less than angelic powers of the human intellect, the lowest in the hierarchy of intellects, can barely cope, there is another object, the *proportionate* object, which the same intellect can handle with ease. "The object that is proportionate to the human intellect according to its natural state is the sensible or material thing;" for the human soul "because of its natural condition postulates being in a body, whose form it is, whence our intellect even by itself lays claim to know impressions received from the senses; therefore it lays claim to know sensible things, as being proportionate to itself."[33]

---

31 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 1, n. 3 [3: 713]: Quidquid entitatem aliquam habet potest ab intellectu nostro cognosci... intellectus noster cognoscit Deum, angelos et res materiales, earumque accidentia et essentiam... quidquid enim est intelligibile, potest intellectu nostro cognosci, nam intelligibile et intellectus sibi mutuo respondent atque adaequantur; sed quidquid habet entitatem est intelligibile: ergo idipsum potest intellectus noster cognoscere aliquo modo.

32 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 1, n. 2 [3: 713]: Obiectum adaequatum intellectus nostri secundum se considerati est ens in tota latitudine sua spectatum... obiectum adaequatum ambit omnia, circa quae potest versari potentia, sed intellectus potest cognoscere quidquid habet rationem entis: id ergo erit obiectum totale ipsius.

33 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 1, n. 5 [3: 714]: Obiectum proportionatum intellectui humano secundum statum naturalem suum est res sensibilis seu materialis... (quia) anima nostra secundum naturalem suam conditionem postulat esse in corpore, cuius forma est, unde intellectus noster etiam ex se vendicat intelligere species a sensibus acceptas: ergo ex se vendicat tantum cognoscere res sensibiles, utpote illi proportionatas.

Focused more narrowly, the proportionate object can be known in two ways: "one way, as knowable by its proper mental impression representing it clearly, and in this way only accidents sensible by themselves are proportioned to our intellect. In another way it is said to be proportionate, because the intellect can quidditatively know it at least by its effects, if they were to be adequate, and in this way material substance would also be proportionate to the human intellect."[34]

But, to make human knowledge possible, how is the disproportion between matter and mind to be overcome, the things known being material and the knower the immaterial intellect? By knowledge of the fact that the human soul, from which the intellect originates, is the form of a body, and is "in some fashion diminished [we could say downgraded] so as to be proportioned to corporeal things. Still, by the fact of its immateriality it [the inferior human intellect] lays claim to understanding those things in an immaterial way."[35]

The human intellect has two aspects, active (*intellectus agens*) and passive (*intellectus possibilis*). There is in the human mind "a certain spiritual power, which they call the active intellect, whose function it is to shed light on the images, and by that way to produce intelligible impressions."[36] Intellect and images have their basis in the human soul, which is conditioned to be linked with a body, so the material and spiritual have a wondrous "order and consonance in their operation" (*mirum habeant ordinem et consonantiam in operando*).[37]

These images, which are rooted in the same soul as the human mind, offer the active intellect, assisted by the imagination, the matter or a sort of exemplar to work on. The active intellect then, "in a manner of

34 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 1, n. 6 [3: 714]: uno modo, quia cognoscibile per propriam speciem ipsum clare repraesentantem, atque hoc modo sola accidentia per se sensibilia proportionari intellectui nostro. Altero modo proportionata dicitur, quia potest quidditative cognosci ab intellectu per effectus saltem, si adaequati fuerint, hocque modo substantiam materialem esse quoque proportionatam humano intellectui.

35 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 1, n. 6 [3: 714]: quia tamen est forma corporis inde quoddammodo dimittitur, ut corporalibus proportionetur, at vero ratione suae immaterialitatis vendicat ut illa intelligat immateriali modo.

36 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 3 [3: 716]: virtutem quamdam spiritualem, quam intellectum agentem vocant, cui munus sit illustrare phantasmata, eoque pacto efficere species intelligibiles.

37 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 12 [3: 719].

speaking, paints the same thing (portrayed in the images) on the passive intellect" (*quasi depingat rem eamdem in intellectu possibili*).[38] Such is the power of intellectual intuition.

Of course all the knowledge that the human intellect has begins with the senses, and the material reality which the senses display to it conceals all the immaterial riches of being in some fashion. These riches can be extricated by the thaumaturgic process of abstraction, a process when methodically applied gives rise to the hierarchy of the sciences.

The process begins by first divesting matter of its individuality, but retaining its sensible specificity, as such becoming the object of the science of *physics*. It then abstracts matter's specificity but retains its intelligibility, as such becoming the object of the science of *mathematics*. It ultimately abstracts from matter as such, whether individual, sensible or intelligible, and so attains the immaterial, as such becoming the object of the science of *metaphysics*.[39]

At this state it is in the empyrean of speculation, freed from the constraints of contingency, bathed in the glow of immateriality, and ready to be transfigured by the glory of revelation. However, it is encompassed with peril, for the further away it finds itself from the senses, the more prone it is to error, which is why the realm of metaphysics is rife with philosophical strife.

Finally, the Scholastics speak of two habits of knowledge, the theoretical (or speculative) and the practical. Suárez observes that these kinds

> differ firstly and by themselves through their intrinsic objective, because the speculative habit stops at the knowledge of the truth which it aims at for its own sake, but the practical communicates the knowledge of the truth as the rule and principle of any human work which has the meaning of praxis. Hence consequently they [the theoretical and the practical] also differ by their kind in the matter with which they concern themselves, because practical knowledge must necessarily have to do with the thing that must be worked on by the knower, because it must closely direct and regu-

38 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 12 [3: 719].

39 *DM* 44: 11: 68 [26: 715]: est sententia valde communis, hanc unitatem obiecti in scientiis sumendam esse ex gradu abstractionis, et ita solet distingui triplex scientia ex triplici abstractione a materia, vel individua tantum, et non omnino a materia sensibili, et non ab intelligibili, vel ab omnibus.

> late his activity. No one's work can have any concern except with the thing that he can work on. Speculative knowledge of itself has to do with a thing that the knower does not have to work on."[40]

Descartes had little patience with this lumbering and cumbersome human intellect, so prone to confusion and contradiction. He replaced it with the angelic intellect, one that is purely spiritual and possessed of a knowledge, in the angelic manner, infused directly into the mind by God (the guarantor of their veracity), and independent of the senses. This infused knowledge, of innate ideas, could give us the knowledge of the external world through its own resources. But there were other thinkers, the empiricists, who could not understand how knowledge of external reality was possible without the concurrence of the faculty whose purpose was precisely to inform the knower of that reality. Empiricists were resigned to not having absolute certainty, appealing to commonsense to witness that no normal human being could be expected to doubt everything. Empiricism, in fact, became a mild form of Skepticism.

At all events, with the onset of the Cartesian and Scientific Revolutions, the Scholastic theory of knowledge was replaced by the epistemologies of Rationalism and Empiricism. *Rationalism* conceives the world as a system with an intelligible structure that a philosopher can explicate through a process of deduction. It is the unfolding of reason by the mind from its own resources, in the form of innate ideas, through a method patterned on the mathematical, ideally without recourse to experience, though experience may be the occasion of those ideas becoming actual. As in mathematics the conclusions would be logically implied in the fundamental premises, and causal relation would be assimilated to logical implication. But unlike mathematics, philosophy would give us truths about existent reality. The method

40 *DM* 44: 13: 42 [26: 733]: concludimus habitum practicum et speculativum differre primo et per se ex fine intrinseco, quia speculativus sistit in contemplatione veritatis quam propter se intendit, practicus tamen tradit cognitionem veritatis, ut regulam et principium alicuius operis humani, quod habeat rationem praxis. Unde consequenter etiam differunt ex suo genere in materia circa quam versatur, quia scientia practica necesario versari debet circa rem operabilem a sciente, quia proxime debet dirigere et regulare operationem eius; non potest autem operatio alicuius versari nisi circa rem ab ipso operabilem; scientia autem speculativa ex se habet versari circa rem non operabilem a sciente.

would be employed to systematize what was already known; to give the form of knowledge to propositions known to be true but not logically demonstrated; and to deduce new truths and so increase our knowledge of reality.

Congruent with rationalism is Descartes's "essentialism," the doctrine asserting the priority of essence over existence, which he adopted in opposition to the Scholastic doctrine of "existentialism," that proclaimed the priority of existence to essence.[41] In this way Descartes undertook his metaphysical speculation against the background of Baroque Scholasticism.

Opposed to rationalism is *Empiricism*, which holds that the nature of things cannot be discovered through pure reason. Reality is conceived as a mass of phenomena beyond which, allegedly, are occult entities, unobserved substances and ultimate causes. Such may exist, but they are beyond human scrutiny. Claims made in favor of them can be disproved through the use of reductive analysis, which reduces the complex to the simple, and the whole to its parts—and in the process discovers what cannot be justified through non-empirical means.

IV. SUAREZIAN INTRA-MENTAL THEMES AS GROUNDWORK FOR MODERN PHILOSOPHY

Descartes and his successors accepted (or did not reject) the systematic structure that Suárez had given metaphysics (in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*); they also employed concepts integral to the Suarezian system that were capable of providing (also through anamorphosis) rich material for the creation of systems alien to Suarezianism. Suárez structured metaphysics in two dimensions, general and special: general metaphysics, a discourse on being as such (*ens ut sic*, nature of being, its attributes and causes); and special metaphysics, a categorization of the types of being (*divisiones entis*, finite and infinite, and substance and accident).[42]

---

41 See Jorge Secada, *Cartesian Metaphysics. The Late Scholastic Origins of Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 2000, especially Chapter 1, pp. 7-26.

42 *General metaphysics*: (metaphysicae) propriam et adaequatam rationem, ac deinde proprietates eius et causas. *DM* 2: 1: intro; 25: 64. *Special metaphysics*: res omnes, quae sub ente continentur, et illius rationem includunt, et sub obiectiva ratione huius scientiae cadunt, et a materia in suo esse abstrahunt, quantum ratione naturali attingi possunt...

Some of the Scholastic concepts concerned the human mind and its workings, but others—and this was distinctive of the Cartesian revolution—were specific to angelic knowledge, as the Scholastics, especially Suárez, envisioned it. For Descartes (as we remarked), impatient at the weakness of the human intelligence, and at its apparent inability to eliminate the lack of certitude that was endemic to metaphysics, sought to endow it with attributes proper to the mind of an angel, for whom certainty was a natural endowment. Suárez's detailed portrait of the disembodied or angelic intelligence is presented in one of his massive works, *De angelis*, published three years after its author's death in 1620. The French philosopher was then 22 years old, and may have read the book and received from it the idea of what the human mind would be like if elevated to the status of the angelic. The exaltation of the Apostate Angel, Cartesian man, from the humble human level to the proud angelic, was the cause of his downfall into the chaos of modern philosophy.[43]

The following concepts, utilized by modern philosophers, are integral to the Suarezian system; some relate to the formal, others to the objective, concept. We examined these concepts in the Prologue; we also, in several places, touched on the themes that can be classified under them. Those in the former category, the formal concept, are the following five, the last two are distinctive of the angelic intelligence, but appropriated by Descartes to the human:

1. Omniconceptualism
2. Intramental criteria for extramental reality
3. Criteria for certainty
4. Elimination of demonic deception
5. Innate ideas

Suarezian concepts in the category of the objective concept are the following five:

1. Types of distinction
2. Substance and modes
3. Disproportion between matter and spirit
4. Individuation
5. Optimal universe

43 Jacques Maritain described Descartes's angelism with great clarity in his *Réflexions sur l'intelligence et sur sa vie propre*. Paris : Desclée de Brouwer, 1924-1930, pp.292-293.See also Ibid. *Le songe de Descartes*. Paris : R.-A. Corrêa, 1932, p, 30.

A more detailed analysis of these concepts than appears in the Prologue follows.

1. Omniconceptualism

To begin with the themes classified under the formal concept, the first of which is what we may (if a neologism be allowed) identify as *omniconceptualism*, the reduction of all reality to concepts, and the apparent negation of extra-mental reality. ("Omniconceptualism" would therefore appear to be more appropriate to describe idealism rather than realism.) From the early 14th century, a distinction began to be made between the *conceptus formalis*, and the *conceptus obiectivus*. According to Petrus Aureolus, (c. 1280-1322), and Joannes Capreolus, (c. 1380-1444), the *conceptus formalis* was the representation of some thing, and the *conceptus obiectivus* (or *objectalis*) was the represented thing itself; it was not really a concept. This distinction was advanced around the time that the interest of philosophers was beginning to turn from extra-mental reality to the intra-mental, from realism to idealism. Favoring this trend was the *Magister Incomparabilis* (*Venerabilis Inceptor, Doctor Invincibilis*) William of Ockham (c.1285-1347), whose impact on Suárez was profound. Philosophers were beginning to be increasingly concerned with mental phenomena (such as concepts, ideas, images and representations), a concern that increased in the 15th century and became dominant from the 16th, in a spectacular manner in Descartes. In his view we know nothing but our own concepts; thought directly attains only itself.[44]

The distinction between the two concepts, formal and objective, was given its definitive form by the uncompromising realist Suárez.

2. Intra-mental criteria for extra-mental reality

Our second theme classified under the formal concept is *the use of intra-mental criteria to establish the truth of extra-mental reality*. This ability functions through both the formal and the objective concepts. Of these two, the formal would appear to be simpler and easier to manage. It is, at any rate, Suárez notes, *notior*, the better known, recognized, approved, acknowledged, than the objective concept. It would thus seem to be the better instrument to ascertain reality, even objective reality;

44 E. J. Ashworth, "Suárez on the Analogy of Being: Some Historical Background," *Vivarium* 33-1 (1995), p. 70.

to determine, for example, the meaning of the most fundamental of notions, the notion of being.

And here Suárez makes the fateful and revolutionary move that we have often referred to, without precedent in Scholastic philosophy, that was to launch a whole new tradition of human thought, when he declares that the character of objective reality, being itself, could best be ascertained through a scrutiny of a subjective phenomenon, the formal concept of being. As he puts it, "we especially intend to explain the objective concept of being as such, according to its total abstraction, according to which we said that it was the object of metaphysics; but because it is indeed rather difficult, and greatly dependent on our conception, we begin with the formal concept, which, as seems to us, can be better known."[45]

Suárez insists on the more evident character of our subjective knowledge than of objective reality, because the formal concept, "insofar as it comes to be through us and in us, seems to be able to be more known to experience; however, the exact knowledge of its unity greatly depends on the unity of the object, from which the acts are wont to to derive their unity and distinction."[46] Besides, these intra-mental acts are more accessible because produced by us and in us (*a nobis et in nobis*).

3. Criteria for certainty

Our third theme classified under the formal concept regards *the terms used to describe the criteria for certainty*. Suárez and Descartes use the same or similar terms in describing such criteria. Those employed by Suárez are five: clear, evident, perfect, open, distinct. *Scientia*, or systematic and well-founded knowledge, declares the Uncommon Doc-

45 *DM* 2: 1: 1 [25: 65]: praecipue intendimus explicare conceptum obiectivum entis ut sic, secundum totam abstractionem suam, secundum quam diximus esse metaphysicae obiectum; quia vero est valde difficilis, multumque pendens ex conceptione nostra, initium sumimus a conceptu formali, qui, ut nobis videtur, notior esse potest.

46 *DM* 2: 1: 9 [25: 68]: quatenus a nobis et in nobis fit, videatur esse posse experientia notior, tamen exacta cognitio unitatis eius multum pendet ex unitate obiecti, a quo solent actus suam unitatem et distinctionem sumere.

tor, "only signifies a *clear* and *evident* and *perfect* cognition or perception of the truth, or of the knowable object."[47]

Knowledge, in general, "is taken for the *open* and *clear* intelligence of any truth whatsoever."[48] Contrasted with the angelic, "our intellect does not adequately conceive by one simple concept, neither does it exhaust a thing conceived *distinctly* or *clearly*, as do God and the angels."[49]

Descartes[50] writes: "so I decided that I could take it as a general rule that the things we conceive very clearly and very distinctly are all true; only there is some difficulty in recognizing which are the things that we distinctly conceive."[51] Here the French philosopher shows his awareness of the fatal flaw of his system. However, he still maintains that "Some things are so transparently clear and at the same time so simple that we cannot ever think of them without believing them to be true."[52]

The *cogito* is the basis of certainty. "I am certain that I am a thinking thing. Do I not therefore also know what is required of my being certain about anything? In this first item of knowledge there is simply a clear and distinct perception of what I am asserting; this would not be enough to make me certain of the truth of the matter if it could turn out that something which I perceived with such clarity and distinct-

47 *DM* 30: 15: 2 [26: 170]: Scientia ...solum significat *claram* et *evidentem* ac *perfectam* cognitionem seu perceptionem veritatis, seu obiecti scibilis... [scientia] generatim sumitur pro aperta et clara intelligentia cuiuscumque veritatis.

48 *DM* 30: 15: 2 [26: 170, scientia] generatim sumitur pro aperta et clara intelligentia cuiscumque veritatis.

49 *DM* 8: 3: 18 [25: 288]: intellectus noster per unum simplicem conceptum non concipit adaequate, neque exhaurit *distincte* et *clare* rem conceptam, sicut faciunt Deus et angeli...

50 Our quotations from Descartes are based on *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff & Donald Murdoch. Cambridge University Press 1985, 2 vol. Abbreviated to *CSM*. Some quotations are taken from Charles Adam & Paul Tannery, *Oeuvres de Descartes*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1897-1913. 13 vols. Abbreviated to *AT*.

51 Descartes, *Discourse on Method* [1637], part 4. *CSM* vol. I, p. 127.

52 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Second Set of Objections*. *CSM* vol. II, p. 104.

ness was false. So now I seem to be able to lay it down as a general rule that whatever I perceive clearly and distinctly is true."[53]

Descartes defines the terms of the criteria of certainty: "I call a perception '*clear*' when it is present and accessible to the attentive mind—just as we say that we see something *clearly* when it is present to the eye's gaze and stimulates it with a sufficient degree of strength and accessibility. I call perception '*distinct*' if, as well as being *clear*, it is so sharply separate from other perceptions that it contains within itself only what is clear."[54]

In sum, the Cartesian method eliminates all doubts; its first rule "was never to accept anything as true if I did not have evident knowledge of its truth: and to include nothing more in my judgements than what presented itself to my mind so clearly and distinctly that I had no occasion to doubt it." [55] Simplicity is the path to the distinctness and clarity of the truth. "We must concentrate our mind's eye totally upon the most insignificant and easiest [or simplest] of matters, and dwell on them long enough to acquire the habit of intuiting the truth distinctly and clearly."[56]

Suárez could hardly disagree about the importance of simplicity, but the simplicity he has in mind is composite while that of Descartes is incomposite. Suárez contrasts the character of human knowledge and the angelic, in that the former consists of composition and division, but the latter of "only a plurality of simple acts."[57] Cartesian man has the mind of the Suarezian angel. But Suarezian man knows simple things complexly. Take for example the concept of "rational", which is the essential differentia of "man," and is one and indivisible. "Yet, to explain this difference, we can divide it into many concepts. For we conceive man to be discursive... and further we conceive man precisely as compositive and divisive, and still further to be simply apprehensive. These various concepts explain nothing else but what was formally

53 Descartes, *Third Meditation*. *CSM* vol. II, p. 25.

54 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, no. 45. *CSM* vol. I, pp. 207-208.

55 Descartes, *Discourse on Method* [1637], part 2. *CSM* vol. I, p. 120.

56 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* [1618?-1628?], Rule 9. *CSM* vol. I, p. 33.

57 *De angelis* 2: 32: 10 [2: 319]: in hoc modo cognitionis nulla est compositio, nec divisio, sed sola *pluralitas actuum simplicium*.

contained in 'rational', and they explain, in parts so to speak, what we apprehended in one con-fused concept."[58]

The fact is that "our mind by inadequate concepts divides a thing that in itself is entirely indivisible, and then, although the thing may be in itself wholly the same, it still does not fall under single concepts according to its total adequate significance."[59] Other examples are " the concept of substance, and the concept of perseity, or of a mode 'by itself'." These "are not distinguished objectively, but only in the manner of conceiving... because the mind cannot explain simple things except in the manner of composite ones, it uses such ways of conception."[60]

Descartes's simplicity, on the other hand, is incomposite. He insists that "we term 'simple' only those things which we know so clearly and distinctly that they cannot be divided by the mind into others which are more distinctly known."[61] Such simplicity would require, according to another rule, the elimination of much of the past tradition of philosophy since "We should be concerned only with those objects, for which our intelligence seems adequate to achieve a certain and indubitable knowledge."[62] We can achieve this methodically, we are told in yet

58 *DM* 30: 6: 18 [26: 94]: rationale... est differentia essentialis hominis, una et indivisibilis... Ad explicandam autem hanc differentiam, possumus eam in plures conceptus dividere. Concipiamus enim hominem esse discursivum... et rursus praecise concipiamus hominem esse compositivum et divisivum, et rursus esse apprehensivum simpliciter. Hi sane omnes conceptus nihil aliud explicant, nisi quod formaliter continebatur in rationali, sed explicant, quasi per partes, quod a nobis confuse uno conceptu apprehenditur.

59 *DM* 30: 6: 12 [26: 93]: mens nostra per inadaequatos conceptus partitur rem in se omnino indivisibilem, et tunc, quamvis res in se omnino sit eadem, tamen non cadit sub singulis conceptibus secundum totam adaequatam rationem suam....

60 *DM* 2: 6: 12 [25: 102]: Hinc sequitur conceptum substantiae, et conceptum perseitatis, seu modi per se, obiective non distingui, sed tantum ex modo concipiendi, ut quod vel ut quo, sicut Deus et Deitas; quia in re proprie non est quo et quod, sed tantum quod; mens autem, quia non potest explicare simplicia nisi ad modum compositorum, utitur illis concipiendi modis.

61 Descartes. *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* [1618?-1628?], Rule 12, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 44.

62 Descartes, *Rules for Guiding One's Intelligence in Searching for the Truth* [1628. Published 1701], Rule 2. Desmond M. Clarke [trans.], *René Descartes. Discourse on Method and Related Writings*. Penguin Books 1999, p. 119.

another rule, "if we reduce convoluted and obscure propositions step by step to more simple ones, and if we try to ascend by the same steps to knowledge of all the others, beginning from an intuition of the most simple propositions."[63] (It would appear then that there is no lack of rules for achieving this priceless simplicity.)

Simple is what can be fully known with ease:

> we are mistaken if we ever judge that we lack complete knowledge of any one of these simple natures. For if we have even the simplest grasp of it in our mind—which we surely must have, on the assumption that we are making a judgement about it—it must follow that we have complete knowledge of it. Otherwise it would not be said to be simple."[64]

And "we need take no great pains to discover these simple natures, because they are self-evident enough."[65]

In sum, "the whole of human knowledge consists uniquely in our achieving a distinct perception of how all these simple natures contribute to the composition of other things."[66]

Unfortunately, the simplicity and obviousness that Descartes preaches is subjective, for it left to the individual to ascertain what is clear and what is not. One can reject as unclear what one cannot understand. As the great pulpit orator and theologian Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) puts it, "Under the pretext that we must not accept anything but what we understand clearly—which, within certain limits, is very true—every one gives himself the liberty to say, 'I understand this, and I do not understand that,' and on this sole basis they admit and reject whatever they like."[67]

---

63 Descartes, *Rules for Guiding One's Intelligence in Searching for the Truth*, Rule 5, Penguin Books, p. 130.

64 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* [1618?-1628?], Rule 12, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 45.

65 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* [1618?-1628?], Rule 12, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 48.

66 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* [1618?-1628?], Rule 12, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 49.

67 Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, Lettre 428 a un disciple du P. Malebranche [the Marquis d'Allemans], 21 May 1687. Ch. Urbain & E. Levesque, *Correspondence de Bossuet*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1910, tom. 3, pp. 373-374.

Certainty is attained through method, one based on intuition and deduction. "A method is required in order to search for the truth about things."[68] Indeed, "a method explains properly how mental intuition should be used, so that we do not fall into error… and how deductions should be found so that we come to have knowledge of all things… nothing further is required to make it complete, since the only way to acquire scientific knowledge is by intuition and deduction"[69]… "These two ways are the most certain routes to knowledge that we have. So far as our powers of understanding are concerned, we should admit no more than these and should reject all others as suspect and liable to error."[70] Descartes explains what they mean. "By 'intuition' I do not mean the fluctuating testimony of the senses or the deceptive judgment of the imagination as it botches things together, but the conception of a clear and attentive mind."[71] By deduction "we mean the inference of something as following necessarily from some other propositions which are known with certainty. But this distinction has to be made, since very many facts which are not self-evident are known with certainty, provided they are inferred from true and known principles through a continuous and uninterrupted movement of thought in which each individual proposition is clearly intuited."[72]

A discontinuous succession of intuitions replaces the continuous logical movement of discourse. Such activity is more in tune with the angelic (than with the human) manner of knowing, for *in hoc modo cognitionis nulla est compositio, nec divisio, sed sola pluralitas actuum simplicium*, "in this kind of cognition there is no composition or division, but only a plurality of simple acts."[73]

---

68 Descartes, *Rules for Guiding One's Intelligence in Searching for the Truth*, Rule 4. Penguin Books, p. 125.

69 Descartes, *Rules for Guiding One's Intelligence in Searching for the Truth*, Rule 4, commentary. Penguin Books, pp. 125-126.

70 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, Rule 3, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 14.

71 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*. Rule 3, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 14.

72 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, Rule 3, commentary. *CSM* vol. I, p. 15.

73 *De angelis* 2: 32: 10 [2: 319].

4. Elimination of demonic deception

Our fourth theme classified under the formal concept concerns the confirmation of certainty through the elimination of demonic deception. Method can assure certainty in what is known as the natural order, the order of things under human control. But can it be assured in the supernatural order, the order of things beyond human control, which includes beings like God, and the angels both good and evil? Can these superhuman beings compel the human mind to assent to falsehood? Not God, replies Suárez:

> You might say: the intellect can on occasion be necessitated by an extrinsic cause, as by God, or by an angel, who, if he is evil, can propose something false in such a way that the intellect cannot dissent… I reply: God can indeed impose necessity on the intellect, even in such things as are not evident…the true and sound doctrine of the theologians teaches that God cannot lead the intellect to falsehood, because it is not less repugnant to His goodness to lie. Hence it is in no way possible that the first origin of falsehood be referred to God leading to it or operating in a special manner. As regards what concerns the angel, it must be said that an angel cannot by his natural power change the intellect to judgment… Hence much less can an evil angel necessitate the intellect to a false assent… for man can always dissent from that… if he wishes.[74]

The approach of Descartes is similar to that of Suárez, and probably influenced by him, as the following quotation makes clear. But modern philosophy's "father" appears to fear demons more than its "founder":

> I will suppose therefore that not God, who is supremely good and the source of truth, but rather some malicious demon of the utmost power and cunning has employed all his energies in order to de-

74 *DM* 9: 2: 7 [25: 323]: Dices: interdum potest intellectus necessitari ab extrinseca causa, ut a Deo, vel ab angelo, qui, si malus sit, potest ita proponere aliquid falsum, ut intellectus dissentire non possit... Respondetur, posse quidem Deum necessitatem inferre intellectui, etiam in his quae evidentia non sunt... vera et sana doctrina theologorum docet non posse Deum inducere intellectum ad falsum, quia non minus eius bonitati repugnat quam mentiri. Unde fieri nullo modo potest ut prima falsitatis origo in Deum speciali modo ad illam inducentem seu operantem referatur. Quod vero ad angelum spectat, dicendum est non posse angelum naturali virtute immediate immutare intellectum ad iudicium... Unde multo minus potest malus angelus necessitare intellectum ad falsum assensum... semper tamen potest homo illi dissentire... si velit.

> ceive me. I shall think that the sky, the air, the earth, colours, shapes, sounds and all external things are merely the delusions of dreams which he has devised to ensnare my judgement. I shall consider myself as not having hands or eyes, or flesh, or blood or senses, but as falsely believing that I have all these things. I shall stubbornly and firmly persist in this meditation; and even if it is not in my power to know any truth, I shall at least do what is in my power, that is, resolutely guard against assenting to any falsehoods, so that the deceiver, however powerful and cunning he may be, will be unable to impose on me in the slightest degree."[75]

5. Innate ideas

Our fifth theme classified under the formal concept regards innate ideas. We have often alluded to the Scholastic classification of intellectual cognition into three types, divine, angelic and human. Divine cognition is increate and omniperfect; the angelic and the human are created and imperfect, or rather, of limited perfection.

Of the three types human cognition is the lowest: it is dependent on material things. We have already described some of its features above (section III). The angelic cognition, for its part, is focused on immaterial reality and independent of material things. Theology portrays the angelic intellect on the basis of what is known of the human. It attributes to the angel a more perfect manner of knowledge than to man, and a more excellent participation of the divine intellect than obtains in the human.[76] The two intellects, angelic and human though specifically different, have a common adequate and generic object, being as such.[77] But they have different formal and specific objects: material reality for the human intellect, and immaterial reality for the angelic.[78]

Another major difference is that the angelic intellect knows through innate ideas,[79] while the human does not.[80] The human mind acquires its knowledge, particularly of material objects, by its own power from

75 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*. First Meditation. *CSM* vol. II, p. 15.

76 *De angelis* 2: 3: 7 [2: 96].

77 *De angelis* 2: 2: 19 [2: 90].

78 *De angelis* 2: 2: 23 [2: 92].

79 *De angelis* 2: 5: 20 [2: 121].

80 *De angelis* 2: 7: 3 [2: 135].

the objects themselves.[81] The angel is an immaterial spirit; his intellect cannot know material reality from those objects,[82] as an immaterial spirit cannot be immediately affected or activated by matter, given the great disproportion between matter and spirit.[83] But matter can activate the immaterial intellect through the mediation of the senses, faculties present in human beings, but not in the angels. This is because the human intellect emanates from a substance, the human soul, which is the form of a material body, the entity from which the senses too evolve.[84] Its need to cooperate with a material faculty, the senses, is the cause of its being downgraded, so to speak,[85] from what would otherwise have been its unalloyed angelic purity.

Descartes, however, isolates the human intellect from the senses. He contends that

> if we bear in mind the scope of our senses and what it is exactly that reaches our faculty by way of them, we must admit that in no case are the ideas of things presented to us by the senses just as we form them in our thinking. So much so that there is nothing in our ideas which is not innate to the mind or the faculty of thinking, with the sole exception of those circumstances which relate to experience, such as the fact that we judge that this or that idea which we now have immediately before our mind refers to a certain thing situated outside us.[86]

Briefly put, "We have within us the sparks of knowledge," our innate ideas, "as in a flint: philosophers extract them through reason."[87]

---

81 *De angelis* 2: 6: 24 [2: 133] & 2: 2: 23 [2: 92].

82 *DM* 35: 4: 21 [26: 464-465] & *De angelis* 2: 2: 23 [2: 92].

83 *De angelis* 2: 6: 10 [2: 128] & 2: 3: 18 [2: 100].

84 *De angelis* 2: 6: 24 [2: 133], & *De anima* 4: 2: 12 [3: 719].

85 *De anima*, lib. 4, cap 1, n. 6 [3: 714]: intellectus… est…quidem spiritualis, quia tamen est forma corporis, inde quodammodo dimittitur, ut corporalibus proportionetur, at vero ratione suae immaterialitatis vendicat, ut illa intelligat immateriali modo.

86 Descartes, *Comments on a Certain Broadsheet* [1647], Reply to Article 13.*CSM* vol.1, p. 304.

87 Descartes, *Cogitationes privatae*, *AT* X, p. 217: sunt in nobis semina scientiae, ut in silice, quae per rationem a philosophis educuntur, per imaginationem a poetis excutiuntur magisque elucent.

Endowed with self-knowledge through its innate ideas, the created intellect, through that knowledge, comes to know other things. For Suárez this is true of the angel. "Any angel first knows himself... Because any angel, since he is a spiritual substance, is of himself intelligible in act and and conjoined to the highest degree with his intellect and commensurate with it; therefore the angel can in the highest degree understand himself. Nay rather this understanding of himself is the foundation, so to speak, of his other understandings, especially natural ones."[88]

The quasi-angelic intellect of Cartesian man operates in a similar manner. As Descartes puts it:

> The mind, knowing itself, but still in doubt about all other things, looks around in all directions in order to extend its knowledge further. First of all it finds within itself ideas of many things; and so long as it merely contemplates these ideas and does not affirm or deny the existence outside itself of anything resembling them, it cannot be mistaken.[89]

Innate ideas can be said to be the launch of modern philosophy; they provided the foundation of Cartesian rationalism.

V. SUAREZIAN EXTRA-MENTAL THEMES AS GROUNDWORK FOR MODERN PHILOSOPHY

1. Types of distinction

We now turn to the themes classified under the objective concept, the first of which refers to the types of distinction. Suárez's influential theory of distinctions that so deeply affected early modern philosophies, is discussed in some 25 pages of disputation 7 of the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* [25: 250-274]. Suárez holds that the knowledge of the kinds of distinction aids one in understanding unity, "since unity includes lack of division, and is therefore opposed to the multitude that arises from division or distinction. So, in order to comprehend all the

88 *De angelis* 2: 27 [2: 85-86]: quilibet angelus primo cognoscit se ipsum... Quia unusquisque angelus, cum sit substantia spiritualis, est de se actu intelligibilis et est maxime coniunctus suo intellectui, et commensuratus illi; ergo maxime potest angelus seipsum intelligere. Quin potius haec cognitio sui est quasi fundamentum aliarum cognitionum praesertim naturalium...

89 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy, Part I. The Principles of Human Knowledge*, no. 13. *CSM* vol. 1, p. 197.

modes of unity, it is necessary to comprehend all the modes of distinction too."[90]

According to this theory there are basically two kinds of distinction: between concepts and realities. Distinction between realities is again of two kinds: the major real distinction (or real distinction proper) and the minor real distinction (known as the modal).

The major real distinction, as between two realities, is mutual; both can each exist without each other, or each separably from the other. This kind of distinction obtains between substances, and between substance and accidents, naturally or through God's absolute power. Suárez defines the major real distinction as follows: "In the first place it is self-evidently known that there is given in things a real distinction, which in order to be better explained is customarily called a distinction of thing from thing; it consists in the fact that one thing is not another, and so too contrariwise."[91]

The minor real or modal distinction is also between two realities, but is non-mutual; one of the realities can exist without the other, but not the latter without the former. A man can exist without running, but when he runs, the running is inseparable from the runner, even by divine power. "I think it is absolutely true" declares Suárez, "that there is given in created things a certain distinction that is actual, and from the nature of the thing, before the operation of the intellect, which is not so great as that found between two wholly distinct things or entities. This distinction, although in general appellation can be called 'real,' because it truly is so on part of the thing itself, and not from an extrinsic denomination by the intellect, however, to distinguish it from

90 *DM* 7, introduction [25: 250]: cum unitas indivisionem includat, et ideo multitudini opponatur, quae ex divisione seu distinctione consurgit, ad comprehendendos omnes modos unitatis, necesse est omnes etiam modos distinctionis comprehendere.

91 *DM* 7: 1: 1 [25: 250]: Primo enim per se notum est, dari in rebus distinctionem realem, quae ad maiorem explicationem appellari solet distinctio rei a re, quae in hoc consistit, quod una res not sit alia, neque e contrario. *DM* 7: 2: 2 [25: 261]: Dico primo: quandocunque duo conceptus obiectivi ita se habent, ut a parte rei et in individuo separari possint, vel ita ut unum sine alio in rerum natura maneat, vel ita ut realiter disiungatur, et realem unionem, quam habebant, amittant, signum est inter illa esse maiorem distinctionem quam rationis ratiocinatae; atque adeo actualem aliquam ex natura rei, seu quae a parte rei sit.

another greater real distinction, external to the intellect... it can more properly be called a modal distinction."[92]

To come back to the distinction between concepts. It is without the separation as occurs between real things, yet with a basis in reality: this is the *distinctio rationis cum fundamento in re*. In the words of Suárez, "it is certain that, besides real distinction, there is given a *distinction of reason*. And it is that which formally and actually does not exist in things which are said to be distinct in this manner, insofar as they exist in themselves, but only insofar as they undergird our concepts, and receive some denomination for them."[93]

Decartes is in entire agreement with this theory. He writes: " I posit only three distinctions: the real, which exists between two substances; the modal and the formal, or of reasoning reason. These three distinctions, however, if they are set off against the distinction of reasoned reason, can be said to be real, and in this sense it is possible to say that essence is really distinct from existence."[94]

Rationalists and empiricists generally seem to have accepted this (Suarezian) theory of the triple distinction.

---

92 *DM* 7: 1: 16 [25: 255]: censeo simpliciter verum esse dari in rebus creatis aliquam distinctionem actualem, et ex natura rei, ante operationem intellectus, quae non sit tanta, quanta est inter duas res seu entitates omnino distinctas, quae distinctio, quamvis generali vocabulo posit vocari realis, quia vere est a parte rei, et non per denominationem extrinsecam ab intellectu, tamen ad distinguendum illam ab alia maiori distinctione reali, extrinsecam ab intellectu... proprius vocari potest distinctio modalis... *DM* 7: 2: 6 [25: 263]: Dico secundo: separatio unius ab alio, quae solum est non mutua... id est, in qua unum extremum potest manere sine alio, non tamen e converso, est sufficiens argumentum distinctionis modalis, non tamen maioris seu realis proprie sumptae.

93 *DM* 7: 1: 4 [25: 251]: Secundo est certum dari, praeter distinctionem realem, distinctionem rationis. Et est illa quae formaliter et actualiter non est in rebus quae sic distinctae denominantur, prout in se existunt, sed solum prout substant conceptibus nostris, et ab eis denominationem aliquam accipiunt.

94 Descartes, Letter CDXVIII to Anonymous, 1645 or 1646. *AT* IV p. 350. Sic igitur pono tantum tres distinctiones: realem, quae est inter duas substantias; modalem et formalem sive rationis ratiocinatae; quae tamen tres, si opponuntur distinctioni rationis ratiocinantis, dici possunt reales, et hoc sensu dici poterit essentia realiter distingui ab existentia.

Suárez makes frequent use of the conceptual distinction; it helps him avoid reifying concepts in the Thomist manner. One such distinction is that between essence and existence. Some Thomists, reifying 'essence' and 'existence', hold that the two are really distinct. But Suárez clearly states "that the essence and existence of the creature, proportionately compared, are not distinguished in reality, or as two real extremes from the nature of the thing, but to be distinguished by concept (reason) ... I judge this opinion to be entirely true. Its foundation, briefly, is that no thing can be intrinsically and formally constituted in the sense of a real and actual being by another distinct from itself..."[95]

Descartes agrees, and affirms that "We are right to separate the two [essence and existence] in our thoughts, for we can conceive [essence] without existence, as we conceive a rose in winter. But they cannot be separated in reality according to the customary distinction; for there was no essence prior to existence, since existence is nothing but existing essence. So one is not prior to the other, nor are they separate or distinct."[96]

As we frequently note, "existent essence" is the correct translation of Suárez's *essentia realis*.

2. Substance and modes

Our second theme classified under the objective concept is that of *substance and modes*. The substance-mode dichotomy played a prominent role in the formation of the major rationalist (and to some extent, empiricist) philosophies. It was taken as a substitute for the Aristotelian predicaments, a predicament being described as *debita dispositio et coordinatio essentialium praedicatorum*, "a due disposition and coordina-

95 *DM* 31: 1: 12 [26: 228]: Tertia opinio affirmat essentiam et existentiam creaturae, cum proportione comparata, non distingui realiter, aut ex natura rei tanquam duo extrema realia, sed distingui tantum ratione... hanc sententiam... existimo esse omnino veram. Eiusque fundamentum breviter est, quia non potest res aliqua intrinsece ac formaliter constitui in ratione entis realis et actualis per aliud distinctum ab ipsa.

96 Descartes, *Responsiones Renati des Cartes ad quasdam difficultates ex Meditationibus eius, etc., ab ipso haustas*. April. 16, 1648. *AT* V, p. 164: Recte nos illa duo cogitatione nostra separamus, quia concipere possumus essentiam sine actuali existentia, ut rosam in hieme; sed tamen reipsa separari non possunt, ut solent distingui, quia essentia ante existentiam non fuit, cum existentia nihil aliud sit aliud quam essentia existens, ut proinde unum altero non prius, nec ab eo diversum aut distinctum.

tion of essential predicates."[97] The ten predicaments were subsumed under the substance-accidents dichotomy, with "substance" being the chief type, and "accidents" distributed into nine types. This list came to be thought of as cumbrous, and was sometimes replaced by the simpler substance-modes dichotomy worked out by Suárez, though not accepted as a substitute by the Doctor himself. The basic substance-accident classification was, he believed, unexceptionable; but there were doubts about the nine accidents. The Philosopher's successors had been unable to simplify the list of nine or agree on its rationale. [Later, Kant made his own list, contending that it was not made in a haphazard fashion like Aristotle's, but by the systematic application of a principle. Still, philosophers like Schopenhauer had their reservations. Hegel focused on the arbitrary way in which Kant's categories were supposedly deduced from the various types of judgment. In his view there was only one category, Difference-in-Identity.]

To come back to Aristotle's predicaments. The list had been rendered sacrosanct by tradition. As Suárez observed: "Now in actual fact the philosophical dogma of the number of the ten predicaments has been received to such a degree, and consequently of the number of the nine genera of accidents besides substance, that it is considered to be almost rash in philosophy to call it in question."[98]

Suárez himself accepted the Aristotelian categories and believed their listing to be pedagogically the best (*omnium aptissimam ad doctrinam tradendam*, *DM* 39: 1: 8; 26: 506). But the flaws he found in the list questioned its philosophical usefulness. No uniform criterion could be applied to them. Some accidents were really distinct from substance, some modally, others conceptually. Only two were absolute accidents, quantity and quality, really distinguished from the substance. "Relation" was in fact identical with its subject, and was only conceptually different from it. "Accident" itself was ambiguously univocal and analogical; univocal with respect to "quality" and "quantity", and analogical with respect to "quality" and "habit."

Of the various schemes used to justify the sufficiency of the Aristotelian categories, four were examined—those of Aquinas, Augustine,

97 *DM* 39: 2: 30 [26: 518].

98 *DM* 39: 2: 13 [26: 513]: Jam vero tam est receptum philosophicum dogma de numero decem praedicamentorum, et consequenter de numero novem generum accidentium praeter substantiam, ut quasi temerarium in philosophia existimetur in dubium revocare.

the Scotist François Mayronnes (1288-1328) and the Nominalist William of Ockham (*Magister Incomparabilis, Venerabilis Inceptor, Doctor Invincibilis*)—and judged deficient. Suárez remarked that "in all their subdivisions, no reasons are given for them, but are voluntarily assumed, and in them the reasons for some predicaments are not rightly explained."[99] Suárez doubted that reasoning could justify the list's sufficiency. "I believe it is true," he said,

> that it is not possible to demonstrate, by a proper reason and a priori, that there are just so many supreme principles, and not more or less. Hence neither does Aristotle himself attempt to demonstrate this position, but always just takes it to be certain. I add that in general, it is probable that as often as the grades, genera and species of things are divided, it is not possible a priori to demonstrate that they are so many and not more, except only when the division refers to two members that are contradictorily opposed, for then it is necessary for all that are comprehended in the division to be contained in either of the members. But when the division is made by multiple differences and positive modes, I do not see how one can demonstrate that there are so many members dividing it and not more.[100]

While expressing reservations about the Aristotelian predicaments, Suárez was also developing his concepts of "mode" and "substance." Here at last was a dichotomy thought unexceptionable according to Suárez's own criterion, which, Spinoza for one believed could be a good substitute for the multiple substance-accident classification. Descartes and Malebranche appear to have been of the same opinion.

---

99 *DM* 39: 2: 18 [26: 514]: in omnibus illis subdivisionibus, nulla ratio earum redditur, sed voluntarie assumuntur, et in eis rationes aliquorum praedicamentorum non recte explicantur.

100 *DM* 39: 2: 18 [26: 514]: non posse ratione propria et a priori demonstrari tot esse genera summa et non plura nec pauciora. Unde neque Aristoteles alicubi hoc demonstrare conatus est, sed tanquam certum id semper supponit. Addo in universum esse probabile, quoties dividuntur gradus, genera aut species rerum, non posse a priori demonstrari tot esse et non plura, nisi tunc solum quando ad duo membra contradictorie opposita revocatur divisio; nam tunc necesse est omnia sub diviso comprehendere in alterutro illorum membrorum contineri. At vero quando divisio fit per plures differentias aut modos positivos, non video quomodo possit a priori demonstari tot esse membra dividentia et non plura.

In both the dichotomous and the multiple classifications, the major category was substance. Medieval philosophers appear to have thought of substance mainly as a substratum or supporter of accidents. However, Suárez re-defined substance, and clarified the concept of mode, the basis of the minor real distinction. Substance for Suárez had two meanings, absolute and relative: *absolute*, as an entity existing in and by itself; and *relative*, as an entity sustaining accidents. In real life we know the relative before the absolute,

> for we come through accidents to a knowledge of substance, and we first know it by the condition of 'standing under' [sub-stratum]. However, if we consider the thing as it is in itself, the other condition or meaning [the absolute one] is unqualifiedly prior, rather it is by itself, without the posterior [or relative] condition, sufficient to convey the significance of substance. Whence in God the most perfect meaning of substance is found, because it [the divine substance] supremely *is* in and by itself, although it does not stand under accidents... This [absolute] meaning is therefore prior and essential.[101]

Spinoza used the substance-mode dichotomy as a prop to his monist doctrine. Descartes, following Suárez, defined *substance* as

> a thing which exists in such a way as to depend on no other thing for its existence. And there is only one substance which can be understood to depend on no other thing whatsoever, namely God. In the case of all other substances, we perceive that they can exist only with the help of God's concurrence… Hence the term 'substance' does not apply univocally… to God and to other things; that is, there is no distinctly intelligible meaning of the term which is common to God and his creatures… But as for corporeal substance and mind (or created thinking substance), there can be understood to

101 *DM* 33: 1: 1-2 [26: 330]: in nomine substantiae... duae rationes seu proprietates indicantur: una est absoluta, scilicet essendi in se ac per se, quam nos propter eius simplicitatem per negationem essendi in subiecto declaramus; alia est quasi respectiva, sustentandi accidentia.... nos enim ex accidentibus pervenimus ad cognitionem substantiae, et per habitudinem substandi eam primo concipimus; si vero rem ipsam secundum se consideremus, altera conditio seu ratio est simpliciter prior, imo ex se sufficiens ad rationem substantiae sine posteriori. Unde in Deo perfectissima ratio substantiae reperitur, quia maxime est in se ac per se, etiamsi accidentibus non substet... Est ergo haec ratio prior et essentialis.

> fall under this common concept: things that need only the concurrence of God in order to exist.[102]

What we perceive are not substances as such but *attributes* of substances. And "each substance has one principal property which constitutes its nature and essence, and to which all its other properties are referred."[103]

While the principal attributes of substances are inseparable from them, there are entities that are separable from their substances and are known as *modes*. [104] In the following passage, Descartes fine-tunes his terms:

> By *mode*… we understand exactly the same as what is elsewhere meant by *attribute* or *quality*. But we employ the term mode when we are thinking of a substance as being affected or modified; when the modification enables the substance to be designated as a substance of such and such a kind, we use the term quality; and finally, when we are simply thinking in a more general way of what is in a substance, we use the term attribute. Hence we do not, strictly speaking, say that there are modes or qualities in God, but simply attributes, since in the case of God, any variation is unintelligible.[105]

3. Disproportion between matter and spirit

Our third theme classified under the objective concept regards the *disproportion between matter and spirit*. For Descartes there is an unbridgeable chasm between the material and immaterial substances. Suárez seems to agree. "A material thing cannot act on spirit, because it has no proportion to it, such as is necessary between agent and patient. And for the same reason a material object cannot produce a spiritual form by its natural powers, because it belongs to a totally inferior order."[106]

---

102 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, nos. 51-52. *CSM* vol. I, p. 210.

103 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part 1, no. 53. *CSM* vol. I, p. 210.

104 José Hellin, "La teoría de los modos en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 6 (1950), pp. 216-226.

105 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part 1, no. 56. *CSM* vol. I, p. 211.

106 *De angelis* 2: 6: 10 [2: 128]: res materialis non potest agere in spiritum, quia non habet cum illo proportionem, quam inter agens et patiens necessa-

Suárez continues:

> unless... the spirit be united to the body, it cannot accept spiritual concepts from a corporeal object... The reason is that spirit, without the intervention of the proper body informed by spirit, cannot immediately receive a concept from the material object, because naturally spirit cannot immediately and directly be impacted, caused, or be excited by the material object, because it is wholly disproportionate to spirit. In order that spirit be excited by a corporeal object, it is necessary that it be naturally united to a body, and that it initiate cognition from it, which it cannot do without the senses. And therefore, it cannot be that a spiritual potency receives concepts from material things without the ministry of the senses. It does not matter that the knowledge of the senses and phantasy be material, because in man they are rooted in the same spiritual soul, and that is enough that by its ministry the intellect can receive concepts proportionate to itself.[107]

Ideas like these led Descartes, but not Suárez, to dualism. Descartes argues that "the mind can be understood as a subsisting thing despite the fact that nothing belonging to the body is attributed to it, and that, conversely, the body can be understood as a subsisting thing despite the fact that nothing belonging to the mind is attributed to it."[108]

---

ria est. Et eadem ratione non potest materiale obiectum spiritualem formam producere virtute naturali, quia est omnino inferioris ordinis.

107 *De angelis* 1: 6: 24 [2: 2]: nisi… spiritus uniatur corpori, non potest a corporalibus obiectis species spirituales accipere... Ratio autem, de qua sine interventu proprii corporis informati a spiritu non possit spiritus immediate a materiali speciem accipere, est, quia naturaliter non potest spiritus immediate et directe pati aut effici, aut excitari ab obiecto materiali, quia est spiritui omnino improportionatum. Ut ergo spiritus a corporeo obiecto excitetur, necessarium est ut sit naturaliter unitus corpori, et quod per illum cognitionem inchoet, quod sine sensibus facere non potest, et ideo fieri non potest, ut sine ministerio sensuum spiritualis potentia species a rebus materialibus accipt. Nec refert quod cognitio sensuum et phantasiae materialis sit, quia in homine sunt radicatae in eadem anima spirituali, et id satis est ut per eius ministerium intellectus speciem sibi proportionatam accipiat.

108 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 159.

4. Individuation

Our fourth theme classified under the objective concept is *individuation*. One of the major philosophical problems of all times, individuation had a special fascination for the realist Suárez, for extramental reality consists only of individual beings. His thought on the much-discussed problem was expressed in a treatise unmatched in its "breadth of topics, incisiveness of thought, clarity of exposition, and systematic arrangement;" indeed, "Suárez's philosophical effort in the area of individuation can be seen only as far superior to anything accomplished before him. And it is not clear that we can find subsequent writers who have surpassed it."[109]

That things exist singularly, individuated each by its own entity, is a view shared by Suárez, Descartes and Leibniz.[110] Suárez categorically declares that "Every thing that exists is necessarily singular and individual,"[111] and that "every singular substance is in need of no other principle of individuation besides its own entity, or besides the intrinsic principles that constitute its entity."[112] But a singular entity also has a common nature that it shares with other individuals, but the differentia that contracts the common nature to a particular individual is not really but only notionally distinct from the concept of its common nature.

Other Scholastics, like the Thomists, explain individuation through the limitation of a presumably vast entity, reified and unlimited in

---

109 Jorge J. E. Gracia (ed.), *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150-1650*. State University of New York Press, 1994, p. 475.

110 Laurence B. McCullogh, *Leibniz on Individuals and Individuation. The Persistence of Pre-Modern Ideas in Modern Philosophy*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996

111 *DM* 6: 2: 2 [25: 206]: Omnis res quae existit, necessario est singulare et individua. Leibniz, in his *Disputatio metaphysica de principio individui*, § 19, quotes the following sentence from *DM* 5: 2: 16 [25: 153], here given in full: Dico tertio, individuum addere supra naturam communem aliquid ratione distinctum ab illa, ad idem praedicamentum pertinens, et individuum componens metaphysice, tanquam differentia individualis contrahens speciem et individuum constituens.

112 *DM* 5: 6: 1 [25: 180] ...videtur... omnem substantiam singularem neque alio indigens individuationis principio praeter suam entitatem, vel praeter principia intrinseca quibus eius entitas constat.....

perfection, through reception into numberless particulars capable of accepting only so much perfection and no more. (This theory was examined in Chapter 4.)

Descartes likewise holds that everything that is posited extra-mentally is particular, and that universals exist merely as objects in the mind, the result of intellectual operation. He implied that every thing that exists "outside our thought" is either an individual substance or the property of a substance; that the actual properties of a substance are "concrete" and opposed to "abstractions."[113]

For Descartes "universals arise solely from the fact that we make use of one and the same idea for thinking of all individual items which resemble each other."[114] For Suárez "similitude" (as for Locke), is the basis of the universals.

For Descartes (as for Suárez) to be a common or universal nature is to be whole in many: a universal arises only after the mind compares many similar singulars. Leibniz, as a young man believed in the singularity theory, which he later elaborated into his characteristic doctrine of monads. These are his words: "I therefore posit that every individual is individuated by its total entity... [and that] an individual adds something over the common nature distinct by reason ... The same therefore Suárez holds..."[115]

6. Optimal universe

Our fifth theme classified under the objective concept is the *optimal universe*. Scholastics and moderns are both concerned not only with individual entities considered discretely, but also with these entities taken together to form comprehensive wholes. The most comprehensive whole is evidently the universe. The question then arises of how and why it came to be. The systems we have been discussing in this work are theistic (except for the Spinozan, described as monistic and atheistic), and profess belief in an omnipotent and all-perfect God who creates out of nothing. Can this perfect God create an imperfect

113 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, n. 59. *CSM* vol I, p. 212.

114 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, n. 59. *CSM* vol. 1, p. 212.

115 Leibniz, *Disputatio metaphysica de principio individui*, sect. 4. G 4, p. 18 "Pono igitur: omne individuum tota sua entitate individuatur... tenet Fr. Suárez disp. Met. 5… [Speaking of Scotus's haecceitas] sect. 19: sunt qui Suaresium ad Scotum trahant, quod asserat Disp. Met. 5, sect. 11, n. 16… Individuum addere aliquid supra communem naturam ratione distinctum..

universe? Both Scholastics and Leibniz agree that He cannot and accept the optimal character of our universe, which consists of created entities that are perfect individually (Leibniz) or typically (the Scholastics). The created entities that comprise the universe, for Leibniz, are the monads, which are individually perfect; for the Scholastics they are material and spiritual beings whose perfection lies in their belonging to the types that represent the gamut of imitable divine perfections (described as mineral, plant, sensible, and intellectual, only the latter being formally predicable of God, the others only eminently). In addition, for Suárez, as for the Scholastics, individual created beings are imperfect, as they are causally dependent and incomplete substances. "Only God is a complete substance without any composition. This Godhead indeed is by itself a substance complete in reality, because it is by itself essentially subsistent, and through itself it does not need anything for the consummate and absolute perfection of substance."[116]

However, Suárez believes, "no complete substance is found in created reality without real composition. A complete real created substance is composed of a nature and its ultimate term [which in fact is subsistence], or which is composed by many or all incomplete substances, which it needs so that it be consummated in its being."[117]

There is at issue here what may be called the Principle of Perfection, which for Suárez would mean that "from a perfect cause—which is both supremely good, envying no one, and most powerful, which can be impeded by no one—no effect could emerge, which was not perfect; and also because God, in creating the universe intends both the

116 *DM* 33: 1: 8 [26: 332]: Solus Deus est substantia completa sine ulla compositione.... est enim his Deus substantia physice seu reipsa completa, quia per seipsam est essentialiter subsistens, et ex se non indiget aliquo ad consummatam et absolutam substantiae perfectionem... At vero in creaturis nunquam reperitur substantia completa sine reali compositione... Quocirca, describendo substantiam creatam physice completam, optime dici potest esse illa quae composita est ex completa natura et ultimo eius termino [id est, subsistentia], seu quae constat et componitur pluribus vel omnibus substantiis incompletis, quibus indiget ut in suo esse sit consummata.

117 *Ibid*.

communication of His goodness and the manifestation of His perfection."[118]

Leibniz's position is somewhat different. He formulates the Principle of Sufficient Reason, according to which the existence of the world, and the whole harmonious system of finite things, requires a sufficient reason why it exists. Why did God choose to make this world rather than another? The answer is of course that God had sufficient reason to do so. But what is that sufficient reason? The answer would take the form of a complementary principle, which for Leibniz is the Principle of Perfection, according to which God always chooses the perfect or the best. "Absolutely speaking, it must be said that another state (of things) could exist; yet (it must also be said) that the present state exists because it follows from the nature of God that He should prefer the most perfect."[119] However, Leibniz is unwilling to admit that God was necessitated to create this world and no other, because, as he says, "In my opinion, if there were no best possible series, God would certainly have created nothing, since He cannot act without a reason or prefer the less perfect to the more perfect."[120] Thus the two principles, of Sufficient Reason and Perfection, appear to be aspects of one and the same principle.

Besides the Suarezian ideas that were anamorphosed, there were others that retained their original meaning without great change. They were the following: basic importance of experience (empiricists); basic importance of the singular (empiricists, Glisson); conceptualist view of the universals (Locke); dual meaning of essence (Locke); analogy (Berkeley), and distinction between existence and subsistence (Berkeley). However, one concept was anamorphosed by the empiricists: substance and modes, which created a storm in British philosophy, until it was calmed (in a manner of speaking) by Hume.

---

118 *DM* 35: 1: 5 [26: 427]: a perfecta causa, et summe bona, quae nulli invidet, et potentissima, quae a nemine impedire potest, non debuit effectus prodire, nisi perfectum; tum etiam quia Deus, in condendo universo intendit et communicationem suae bonitatis et suae perfectionis manifestationem.

119 Leibniz, quoted in Grua, G. (ed.), *G.W.Leibniz. Textes inédits*, 2 vol. Paris, 1948. Vol. 1, p. 393.

120 Leibniz, Letter 83 to des Bosses of September 7, 1711. *Briefwechsel zwischen Leibniz und des Bosses, 1706-1716*. G 2 pp. 424-425: Meo iudicio, nisi daretur series optima, nihil plane crearet Deus quia non potest agere praeter rationem, seu praeferre minus perfectum alteri perfectiori.

De quibus longam, et mille difficultatibus plexam disputationem nobis dant obscuri philosophi, *nodum in scripto quaerentes*, et ingenii specie, obtenebrantes ea quibus ab ipsa natura lumen affulget. *Universa philosophia*, cap. 2.

CHAPTER 6
THE IMPACT OF SUÁREZ ON THE RATIONALISTS AND THEIR SUCCESSORS

INTRODUCTION: FORMS OF RATIONALISM

I. DESCARTES'S DUALISM

1. Innate ideas
2. Substance and modes
3. Dualism
4. Interrelationship of mind and body
5. Suárez's anticipated critique of Cartesianism

II. MALEBRANCHE'S ONTOLOGISM

1. Substance and modes, thought and extension
2. Insufficiency of the soul and its modes of knowledge
3. Vision in God

III. SPINOZA'S MONISM

1. Categories: Spinoza and Descartes
2. Spinoza's dyad or triad of categories
3. Modes (*natura naturata*)
4. God (*Natura naturans*)
5. Suárez's anticipated critique of Spinozism
6. The divinization of man

IV. LEIBNIZ'S MONADISM

1. *Cogitabilitas*
2. Innate ideas
3. Substance & modes
4. Monads
5. Optimal universe: proof and disproof
6. Streamlined metaphysics: Wolff

V. COMPLETED ANAMORPHISM OF SUÁREZ'S METAPHYSICS

1. Supertranscendentalists
2. Kant
3. Hegel
4. Schopenhauer
5. Nietzsche

INTRODUCTION: FORMS OF RATIONALISM

Emerging from the anamorphosed existentialism of Suárez was a powerful style of philosophizing, Rationalism. In its ideal form this style conceives the world as an intelligible structure which can be disclosed through a process of deduction. It is the unfolding of reason by the mind from its own resources, in the form of innate ideas, through a method patterned on the mathematical, without recourse to experience, though experience may be the occasion of those ideas becoming actual. As in mathematics the conclusions would be logically implied in the fundamental premises, and causal relation assimilated to logical implication. But unlike mathematics, philosophy would give us truths about existent reality. The method would be employed to systematize what was already known; to increase our knowledge of reality; and to give the form of knowledge to propositions known to be true but not logically demonstrated.

Rationalism evolved in four great systems: the dualism of Descartes, the ontologism of Malebranche, the monism of Spinoza, and the monadism of Leibniz.

Cartesian dualism is the theory that the human person consists of two complete and mutually exclusive substances, which however are not two ultimate, independent ontological principles. They are the extended (or matter) and the unextended (or spirit). The extended substance, or *body*, is divisible, unthinking, partite, and distinct from every other corporeal substance. The unextended substance, or *soul* (also, mind, consciousness), is indivisible, thinking, simple, and distinct from every other incorporeal substance. Mind knows, not through body, but through innate ideas. This dichotomy of mind and matter is somehow said to form a unit, with the whole mind united to the whole body, intermingled with it, so to speak. The mind is not merely lodged in a body like a sailor in a ship.

Malebranchian ontologism (or *occasionalism)* is the doctrine that spirit and body in man are so diverse as to be unable to interact, but their every desire to do so is an occasion for God to intervene and produce the interaction desired. Spirit knows not through body but through vision in God.

Spinozan monism is the theory that there is only one substance, the divine, with an infinity of modes, only two of which are known to us, thought and extension (the two categories of Cartesian dualism).

Leibnizian monadism is the theory that reality consists of an infinity of immaterial monads or active substances, God being the supreme monad. These monads conspire in a universal harmony, with God as its principle, for the attainment of a common end. But the monads do not directly interact; the harmony among them is divinely pre-established, each monad reflecting the whole universe.

In sum: Cartesianism and Malebranchianism are pluralisms of heterogeneous substances, Spinozism is a monism of a unique homogeneous substance; and Leibnizianism is a pluralism of numberless homogeneous substances. The thought of Suárez has left its impress on them in one way or another.

I. DESCARTES'S DUALISM

What the philosophy of Descartes owes to Suárez can be discussed under four heads: 1) innate ideas, 2) substance and modes, 3) dualism, and 4) mind-body interrelationship. Innate ideas are the intramental category of the Cartesian system, substance and modes its extra-mental category; dualism, its philosophical foundation; and the mind-body interrelationship its irresolvable problem. We touched on these topics in earlier chapters, but further clarification is needed in the present context.

1. Innate ideas

The first of our four heads are *innate ideas*, a mode of thought, according to Suárez, connatural to the angels, and now, according to Descartes, even to man. All the three notes of angelic knowledge, as Suárez conceives it, apply to the human, as visualized by Descartes—of being intuitive in its mode, innate in its origin, and independent of things in its nature. The deepest quality of angelic cognition is not that it is intuitive or innate, but that it is independent of objects. The Car-

tesian view of human knowledge is thus radically different from the Scholastic, which is a knowledge that is derived from the senses. (We described it at some length in Chapter 5.) Cartesian knowledge can therefore only be posited if connection with the senses is negated.

Descartes has no doubts about the non-sensible character of human knowledge. He contends that

> if we bear in mind the scope of our senses and what it is exactly that reaches our faculty by way of them, we must admit that in no case are the ideas of things presented to us by the senses just as we form them in our thinking. So much so that there is nothing in our ideas which is not innate to the mind or the faculty of thinking, with the sole exception of those circumstances which relate to experience, such as the fact that we judge that this or that idea which we now have immediately before our mind refers to a certain thing situated outside us. We make such a judgement not because these things transmit the ideas to our mind through the sense organs, but because they transmit something which, at exactly that moment, gives the mind occasion to form these ideas by means of the faculty innate to it. Nothing reaches our mind from external objects through the sense organs except certain corporeal motions.[1]

In consequence, concludes the father of modern philosophy, "we shall without difficulty set aside all the prejudices of the senses and in this respect rely upon our understanding alone by reflecting carefully on the ideas implanted therein by nature."[2]

Our ideas then, are innate, but not innate in the sense that they are present in the baby's mind as fully-fledged ideas. The mind produces them, as it were, out of its own potentialities on the occasion of experience of some sort. It does not derive them, as we noted, from sense-experience, but sense-experience can furnish the occasion on which these ideas are formed. The clear and distinct innate ideas are to be distinguished from the confused "adventitious" ideas caused by sense experience, and from the "factitious" ideas constructed by the imagination. Descartes seems to have first intended to restrict innate ideas only to the clear and distinct ones, distinguishing them from the adventitious and the confused, but that later he came to think that all

1 Descartes, *Comments on a Certain Broadsheet* [1647], Reply to Article 13, *CSM* vol. I, p. 304.

2 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy* [1644-1647]. Part II, n. 3.*CSM* vol. I, p. 224.

ideas are innate, in which case, not all ideas are clear and distinct—an anomalous state of affairs for the Cartesian system.

Be that as it may, the mind is a repository of a plurality of ideas, ready-made, self-evident, irreducible, each (hopefully) clear by itself, each the object of primary intuition. All knowledge is reducible to them. They are like atoms of obviousness and intelligibility. They are not formally resolved into the notion of being. In them can be discovered the first principles or first causes of everything which is or which can be in the world without "deriving them from any other source than certain germs of truth which exist naturally in our souls."[3] In an expressive description of them Descartes notes: "We have within us sparks of knowledge, as in a flint: philosophers extract them through reason."[4]

We may even be able to construct metaphysics and physics by logical deduction from a number of innate ideas implanted in the mind by 'nature' or, as we afterwards learn, by God. Intelligence becomes the lawgiver in speculative matters; it fashions its object. Indeed, intelligence would appear to be the substance of which the innate ideas are the modes. Descartes seems to stress this point when he says:

> I never wrote or concluded that the mind required innate ideas which were in some way different from its faculty of thinking; but when I observed the existence in me of certain thoughts which proceeded, not from external objects or from the determination of my will, but solely from the faculty of thinking within me, then, in order that I might distinguish the ideas and notions (which are the forms of these thoughts) from some other thoughts adventitious or factitious, I termed the former 'innate.'[5]

It would seem that, for Descartes, innate ideas are *a priori* forms of thought which are not really distinct from the faculty of thinking. Axioms are not present in the mind as objects of thought from the beginning; but they are virtually present in the sense that by reason of its

---

3 Descartes, *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking the Truth in the Sciences*, Part 6 [1637]. *CSM* vol. I, pp. 143-144.

4 Descartes, *Cogitationes privatae*, *AT* X, p. 217: sunt in nobis semina scientiae, ut in silice, quae per rationem a philosophis educuntur, per imaginationem a poetis excutiuntur magisque elucent.

5 Descartes, *Comments of a Certain Broadsheet* [1647], Reply to Article 12. *CSM* vol I, p. 303.

innate constitution the mind thinks in these ways. Descartes's theory would thus anticipate Kant's doctrine of *a priori*, with the difference that Descartes does not believe (as does Kant) that the *a priori* forms of thought are applicable only within the field of sense experience.

2. Substance and modes

Our second head is *substance and modes*, evidently a Suarezian dichotomy. Descartes defines "substance" as

> a thing which exists in such a way as to depend on no other thing for its existence. And there is only one substance which can be understood to depend on no other thing whatsoever, namely God. In the case of all other substances, we perceive that they can exist only with the help of God's concurrence.[6]

What we perceive however are not substances as such but attributes of substances, for "each substance has one principal property which constitutes its nature and essence, and to which all its other properties are referred."[7] The principal attributes are inseparable from their substances. But there are entities that are separable from the substance, in the sense that the latter can exist without them, but not they without the latter. These entities are the "modes" that were discussed at length in Chapter 5.

3. Dualism

Our third head is *dualism*. Scholasticism sees man as a unity; the human soul is the principle of biological, sensitive and intellectual life. But Cartesianism views man as a duality, composed of two mutually exclusive substances, mind and body. Descartes's proof of dualism assumes that our thought corresponds to objective reality: "we commonly judge that the order in which things are mutually related in our perception of them corresponds to the order in which they are related in actual reality."[8] "And we can have no better evidence for a distinction between two things than the fact that if we examine either of them, whatever we find in one is different from what we find in the

---

6 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, no. 51. *CSM*, vol. I, p. 210.

7 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, no. 53. *CSM*, vol. I, p. 210.

8 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641], *CSM* vol. II, p. 159.

other."[9] Such a conclusion is guaranteed by the Cartesian criterion of certainty:

> I know that everything which I clearly and distinctly understand is capable of being created by God so as to correspond exactly with my understanding of it. Hence the fact that I can clearly and distinctly understand one thing apart from another is enough to make me certain that the two things are distinct, since they are capable of being separated, at least by God. [10]

> Also the fact that we often see two things joined together does not license the inference that they are one and the same; but the fact that we sometimes observe one apart from the other entirely justifies the inference that they are different… It is a contradiction to suppose that what we clearly perceive as two different things should become one and the same (intrinsically one and the same, not merely combined); this is no less a contradiction than to suppose that what are in no way distinct should be separated. [11]

Descartes never tires of restating this principle of separation derived from the Suarezian theory of distinctions: "the mere fact that I can clearly and distinctly understand one substance apart from another is enough to make me certain that one excludes the other."[12]

Descartes then applies this principle to the two entities, mind and body: "the mind can be perceived distinctly and completely… without any of the forms and attributes by which we recognize that body is a substance… And similarly, a body can be understood distinctly as a complete thing, without any of the attributes which belong to the mind."[13] "Thus, simply by knowing that I exist and seeing at the same time that absolutely nothing belongs to my nature or essence except

---

9 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641], *CSM* vol. II, p. 160.

10 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy* [1641]. Sixth Meditation, *CSM* vol. II, p. 54.

11 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Sixth Set of Objections*, *CSM* vol. II, p. 299.

12 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II p. 159.

13 Descartes, *Author's reply to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 157.

that I am a thinking thing, I can infer correctly that my essence consists solely in the fact that I am a thinking thing."[14]

What about my body, then?

> It is true that I may have (or, to anticipate, that I certainly have) a body that is very closely joined to me. But nevertheless, on the one hand I have a clear and distinct idea of myself, in so far as I am simply a thinking, non-extended thing; and on the other hand I have a distinct idea of body [in general, or my body], in so far as this is simply an extended, non-thinking thing. And accordingly, it is certain that I [that is, my soul, by which I am what I am, French version] am really distinct from my body, and can exist without it.[15]

To elaborate:

> if something can exist without some attribute, then it seems to me that that attribute is not included in its essence. And although mind is part of the essence of man, being united to a human body is not strictly speaking part of the essence of mind.[16]

In another place, Descartes actually casts his argument in the form of the despised syllogism: "Now if one substance can exist apart from another, the two are really distinct. But the mind and body are substances which can exist apart from each other. Therefore there is a real distinction between the mind and the body."[17]

Descartes frequently emphasizes the total difference between mind and body: "it is equally true that when I examine the nature of the body, I find nothing at all in it which savours of thought."[18] As for the body, " extension in length, breadth and depth constitutes the nature of corporeal substance."[19] In that case soul and body would be complete

14 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy [1641]*. Sixth Meditation. *CSM*, vol. II, p. 54.

15 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy [1641]*. Sixth Meditation. *CSM*, vol. II, p. 54.

16 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 155.

17 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Second Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 120.

18 Descartes, *Author's reply to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 160.

19 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, n. 53. *CSM* vol. I, p. 210.

and not the incomplete substances that the Scholastics claim that they are (and as such cannot form a unitary entity like man). As Descartes uncompromisingly declares, "I understand a thinking substance to be just as much a complete thing as an extended substance."[20]

In another place Descartes tries to have it both ways and states that "It is also possible to call a substance incomplete in the sense that, although it has nothing incomplete about it *qua* substance, it is incomplete in so far as it is referred to some other substance in conjunction with which it forms something which is a unity in its own right… the mind and the body are incomplete substances when they are referred to a human being which together they make up."[21]

Descartes prefers to talk of the mind, which he describes as continually thinking: "I do not doubt that the mind begins to think as soon as it is implanted in the body of an infant, and that it is immediately aware of its thoughts, even though it does not remember this afterwards because the impressions of these thoughts do not remain in the memory."[22] And what is thought? "By the term 'thought' I understand everything which we are aware of as happening within us, in so far as we have awareness of it. Hence, thinking is to be identified here not merely with understanding, willing and imagining, but also with sensory awareness."[23]

Mind is indivisible and impartite, for "we cannot understand a mind except as being indivisible. For we cannot conceive of half a mind."[24] Indeed, "when I consider the mind, or myself in so far as I am merely a thinking thing, I am unable to distinguish any parts within myself; I understand myself to be something quite single and complete."[25] And mind is unaffected by what happens to the body:

---

20 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 157.

21 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 157.

22 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Fourth Set of Objections* [1641]. *CSM* vol. II, p. 171-172.

23 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, no. 9. *CSM* vol. I, p. 195.

24 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Synopsis of the Following Six Meditations. *CSM* vol. II, p. 9.

25 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Sixth Meditation. *CSM* vol. II, p. 59.

> Although the whole mind seems to be united to the whole body, I recognize that if a foot or arm or any other part of the body is cut off, nothing has thereby been taken away from the mind, As for the faculties of willing, of understanding, of sensory perception and so on, these cannot be termed parts of the mind, since it is one and the same mind that wills and understands and has sensory perceptions.[26]

But when all is said and done, Descartes confesses that his position is indemonstrable. "Can I show my critics," he queries,

> that it is self-contradictory that our thought should be reduced to corporeal motions? By 'reduced' I take it that they mean that our thought and corporeal motions are one and the same. My reply is that I am very certain of this point, but I cannot guarantee that others can be convinced of it...[27]

4. Interrelationship of mind and body

Our fourth head is the *relationship of mind and body*. Descartes's criteria of certainty (clarity and distinctness) lead him to conclude that body and soul are two complete and mutually exclusive substances, and so, by Suarezian standards, they cannot form a substantial union, for "a subject in which we understand only extension and various modes of extension is a simple entity; so too is a subject in which we recognize only thought and various modes of thought. But that which we regard as having at the same time both extension and thought is a something composite, namely a man, consisting of a soul and a body."[28] But this does not explain how such a composite (of two mutually irreducible substances) is possible.

Descartes only solution to this problematic composite appears to be that of Suárez's angelic spirit who assumes a human body (for carrying out God's commands in the world). We here compare two sets of irreducible substances—the Cartesian soul and body, and the Suarezian angel and assumed body.[29] Suárez holds that the union between

---

26 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Sixth Meditation, *CSM* vol. II, p. 59.

27 Descartes, *Author's Replies to the Sixth Set of Objections*. *CSM* vol. II, p. 287.

28 Descartes, *Comments on a Certain Broadsheet*, *CSM* vol. I, p. 299.

29 *De angelis*, 4: 33-38 [2: 536-559].

spirit and body is of two kinds, substantial and accidental; the substantial union itself is of two sorts, substantial form (as is the case of the human soul, the form of the mortal human body), or hypostatic union (as is the case with the Incarnation). The angelic assumption of a human body is neither substantial nor accidental, but is a kind of intimate substantial presence (of a spirit) in a kind of material robot, adapted to what only appears to be a genuine human body.[30] While functioning solely through an extrinsic mover (the angelic spirit) the robotic body seems to be moved by an intrinsic principle, and gives the impression of seeing, hearing and performing other organic bodily functions. In contrast, the human soul does not assume a human body, but naturally informs it, controlling all its functions which are authentically organic.

But Descartes is unwilling to have the soul simply lodge in a body functioning as a kind of extrinsic vehicle or instrument, with the body itself being a robot void of all feeling. He claimed that he showed how "it is not sufficient for it (the soul) to be lodged in the human body like a helmsman in his ship, except perhaps to move its limbs, but that must be more closely joined and united with the body in order to have, besides this power of movement, feelings and appetites like ours, and so compose a real man."[31] In fact Nature also teaches me "by these sensations of pain, hunger, thirst and so on, that I am not merely present in my body as a sailor is present in a ship, but that I am very closely joined and, as it were, intermingled with it, so that I and my body form a unit."[32] But this reply did not satisfy the empiricist Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655), who queried:

---

30 *De angelis*, 4: 36: 8 [2: 549]: concludimus angelum non uniri corpori, proprie et formali unione etiam accidentali, ac proinde solum assistere illi per intimam substantialem praesentiam, tanquam motor ad mobile cum particulari respectu ad peculiarem usum eius. *Ibid*., 4: 38: 5 [2: 554]: Quia revera, licet in corpore assumpto sit quaedam pars habens figuram et speciem oculi, per quam existimari a aliis potest videns, et similiter possit reputari audiens per apparentes aures, nihilominus in re ipsa non solum non fit visio vel auditio, verum etiam neque fit aliquid reale habens convenientiam aliquam cum illis actionibus. Sed angelus solo intellectu percipit, quae verus homo videndo vel audiendo sentiret.

31 Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, Part 5. *CSM* vol. 1, p. 1 41.

32 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Sixth Meditation. *CSM* vol. II, p. 56.

> You still have to explain how that 'joining and, as it were, intermingling'… can apply to you if you are incorporeal, unextended and indivisible… If you wholly lack parts, how are you intermingled or 'as it were intermingled' with the particles of this region? Moreover, since all compounding, conjunction or union takes place between the component parts, must there not be some relation between the parts? Yet what relation can possibly be understood to exist between corporeal and incorporeal parts?[33]

In a word, concludes Gassendi, "the general difficulty still remains of how the corporeal can communicate with the incorporeal and of what relationship may be established between the two."[34] The father of modern philosophy has no answer.

Descartes's inability to explain the interaction between mind and body satisfactorily led a Cartesian like Arnold Geulincx (1625-1669) to maintain a theory of *occasionalism*, according to which there is no real causal interaction between soul and body. On the occasion of an act of my will, for example, God moves my arm. Descartes himself spoke of external objects transmitting to the mind through the organs of sense, not ideas themselves, but "something which, at exactly that moment, gives the mind the occasion to form those ideas by means of the faculty innate to it."[35] Such a passage suggests two series of events, ideas in the mental series and movements in the corporeal series, the latter being the occasion on which the former are produced by the mind itself. And inasmuch as Descartes stressed the constant conserving activity of God in the world, this conservation being interpreted as an ever-renewed creation, one might draw the conclusion that God is the only direct causal agent.

5. Suárez's anticipated critique of Cartesianism

Our fifth head is Suárez's anticipated critique of Cartesian dualism. He writes:

---

33 Descartes, *Fifth Set of Objections*. On the Sixth Meditation, no. 5. *CSM* vol. II, p. 238.

34 Descartes, *Fifth Set of Objections*. On the Sixth Meditation, no. 5. *CSM* vol. II, p. 239.

35 Descartes, *Comments on a Certain Broadsheet* [1647]. Reply to Article 13. *CSM* vol.1, p. 304.

> Furthermore, in the matter [or physical substance] of man there will be another substantial form [a material one in addition to the soul, the form of the body] actuating it, from which there will result an integral and complete corporeal substance; therefore there will be in man two substantial and integral supposita, one spiritual and the other corporeal. And so from them there will result an entity that is one not by itself, but by aggregation... Man cannot therefore be essentially an assemblage of those two substances, because they are only accidentally united, and they do not form what is one by itself; therefore man will essentially be only one substance by itself, and it will not be spiritual, but hence material. But that substance is essentially irrational, as the form by which it is constituted is not a principle of understanding, but only of sensing, like the soul of a horse; man will essentially be an animal, which is most absurd.[36]

II. MALEBRANCHE'S ONTOLOGISM

1. Substance and modes, thought and extension

Malebranche followed in the footsteps of Descartes and prepared the way for Spinoza. He made Descartes's ideal his own: the search for truth through clear and distinct ideas, and procedure in an orderly way in the manner of the mathematicians, passing from the simple to the complicated. He was also deeply affected by Cartesian dualism, as well as by the illuminationism of the revered Church Father Augustine (354-430), according to whom the human mind knows the eternal truths through immediate illumination by the divine light. Dualism combined with illuminationism produced Ontologism (the distinctive

36 *Commentaria una cum quaestionibus in libros Aristotelis De anima*. Ed. Salvador Castellote, tom. 1. Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios y Publicaciones, 1978, disp. 2, qu. 4 num. 4, p. 256: Rursus, in materia hominis erit alia forma substantialis actuans illam, ex quibus resultabit substantia integra corporalis completa; ergo erunt in homine duo supposita substantialia integra: unum spirituale et aliud corporale. Et sic ex his non fit unum per se, [sed per aggregationem] sicut ex caelo et intelligentia movente. Homo igitur non potest esse essentialiter congregatum illarum duarum substantiarum, quia illa duo tantum accidentaliter uniuntur, et non faciunt unum per se; erit ergo homo essentialiter una tantum per se substantia ex illis; et non spiritualis; ergo materialis. Illa autem substantia essentialiter est irrationalis, quia forma per quam constituitur non est principium intelligendi, sed sentiendi tantum, sicut anima equi; erit ergo homo essentialiter brutum, quod est absurdissimum.

mark of Malebranchian philosophy), the doctrine that human reason has an immediate and intuitive knowledge of the divine essence, not however in itself, but as externally imitable in creatures. Our vision of the divine essence is therefore not the Beatific Vision.

-Thus Malebranchianism was a philosophy bordering on the mystical and thus alien to the conceptual complexities of Scholasticism. A basic simple (Suarezian) category would suffice as the basis of this philosophy, one accepted both by the fervid theist Malebranche and by the impassioned atheist Spinoza, expressed by the latter in the following words "All that exists is either substance or a mode of substance,"[37] and by the former described as follows:

> All that exists can be conceived by itself or not at all. There is no middle, as the two propositions are contradictory. Now all that can be conceived by itself and without thinking of another thing —which one can, I say, be conceived by itself as existing independently of any other thing, or without the idea which one has of itself representing any other thing —such a thing is assuredly a being or a substance: and all that cannot be conceived by itself, or without thinking of any other thing, is a manner of being, or a modification of substance… We have no other way of distinguishing substances or beings, modifications or sorts of being, except by the different ways by which we perceive things.[38]

---

37 Malebranche, *De la recherche de la vérité* [Search After Truth, 1674-1678]. Ed. Genevieve Rodis-Lewis & Pierre Clair, 3 vol. André Robinet (ed.), *Oeuvres completes de Malebranche*, Paris 1962-1964, vol. 1, p. 437. Referred to as *Recherche*. Quotations in Desmond Connell, *The Vision in God. Malebranche's Scholastic Sources*. New York: Humanities Press, 1967.

38 Malebranche, André Robinet (ed.), *Entretiens sur la métaphysique et sur la religion*. [Dialogues on Metaphysics, 1688]. *Oeuvres completes de Malebranche*, Paris 1965, Entretien I, section II. Vol. 12, pp. 33-34. Quoted by Connell, *The Vision in God. Malebranche's Scholastic Sources*. New York: Humanities Press, 1967, p. 15, footnote 31: Tout ce qui est on le peut concevoir seul, ou on ne le peut pas. Il n'y a point de milieu, car ces deux propositions sont contradictoires. Or tout ce qu'on peut ce concevoir seul, & sens penser à autre chose chose, qu'on peut, dis-je, concevoir seul comme existent indépendemment de quelqu'autre chose, ou sans que l'idée qu'on en a represente quelqu'autre chose, c'est assurément un être ou une substance: & tout ce qu'on ne peut concevoir seul, ou sens penser à quelqu'autre chose, c'est une maniere d'être, ou une modification de substance... Nous n'avons point d'autre voie pur distinguer les substances ou les êtres, des modifications ou des façons d'être, que par les diverses manieres dont nous appercevons ces choses.

For Malebranche each substance possesses an *attribute* that constitutes its essence. The essence is that which is conceived first in a thing, is inseparable from it, and on which all its properties depend. The essence of material substance is *extension*, because there is no body that is not extended. All the properties of a body presuppose the attribute of extension, and they can all be deduced from it.[39] Similarly the essence of spiritual substance is pure intellectual *thought*, for although it is possible to conceive a mind or soul that neither senses, imagines or wills, it is not possible to conceive one that does not engage in pure intellectual thought; and sensation, imagination and will are modifications that presuppose pure intellectual thought.[40]

Substance and attribute are differentiated only in concept. But the substance-and-modes distinction is more than conceptual, though it is not as real as between substance and accident. Simply put, it is the minor real distinction known as the modal. To a substance an accident contributes a further perfection, but a mode none at all: the whole reality of the modified substance is the reality of the substance, which is a constant and unalterable quantity.

Since thought and extension are mutually exclusive attributes, soul and body are distinct and mutually opposed substances. When joined together they remain unchanged. The soul does not really act on the body or the body on the soul, but rather, the soul's wishes are continually read by God who acts immediately on the body according to these wishes. The wishes of soul and body to interact form the "occasion" for God to intervene and make mental events to correspond to physical perceptions and actions. Which explains this philosophy's other title, "occasionalism." This theory allows the soul to command the body without causally affecting it. The created agent's activity is minimized so as to be practically non-existent. God is the only true cause.[41]

2. Insufficiency of the soul and its modes of knowledge

The category of substance and modes does not have the same importance in the thought of Malebranche as in that of Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz. More crucial to the Oratorian's thinking is the dualism

39 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk 3, part 1, ch. 1, no. 1.

40 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk 3, part 1, ch. 1, no. 1.

41 Malebranche, *Entretiens* 7, section 9, pp. 158-160.

of soul and body, which is more rigid even than that of Descartes. Our Ontologist accepts the Cartesian view that all certain knowledge consists in the pure intellectual intuition of clear and distinct ideas. The thinking self is the soul or mind; it is a substance, distinct from the body, whose essence is thought; it is totally sufficient in relation to the body and the material world. No interaction is possible between body and soul.

The body cannot act on the soul because (according to the Augustinian principle of subordination) no inferior being can act upon its superior. Besides, the body is matter, and matter is purely passive (and so cannot affect the active soul). Neither can soul act on body, because that would depend on the soul's will having a necessary connection with the body, which it does not.

Soul and body are united only in the sense that God has related them as mutually corresponding occasional causes of His own activity, the unique real cause of their modifications. When the soul wills to move its body the body is moved by God in accordance with the general law that establishes the desires of the soul as the occasional causes of His activity in the body. [One wonders what God's purpose was in creating a contrived entity of two heterogeneous substances that are really not interacting while God creates the pretense and indeed deliberate hoax that they are.]

The soul is really united only with what is capable of acting on it, and so it is really united to God alone, and this is why the only union that is essential to it is not its union with the body, but with God exclusively.[42] This union is one of total dependence, which manifest's the soul's insufficiency, the insufficiency of its various modes of cognition. These limitations differentiate the systems of Malebranche and Descartes.

For Descartes the self is the primary object of its own thought, which is a pure intellectual intuition of clear and distinct ideas that are innate, and not derived by abstraction from sense experience. But for Malebranche the soul is not sufficient in itself as a thinking substance. Unlike the Cartesian soul, the Malebranchian is not its own light. While its knowledge is a pure intellectual intuition, the primary object of this intuition is not itself, but an intelligible reality really distinct

42 Malebranche, *Entretiens*, Entretien 7, section 15, p. 168: Notre ame n'est point uni à notre corps selon les idées vulgaires. Elle n'est unie immédiatement et directement qu'à Dieu seul.

from it, God. [It is difficult to see how the soul's essence as thought can be constituted by an object that is distinct from that essence; how in other words something intrinsic to an essence is constituted by something extrinsic to it.] The soul's clear and distinct ideas are innate in the sense that they are not (as the Scholastics claim) derived from abstraction from sense experience; but they are not innate in that the self does not produce them from its own resources, for that would put it on the same level with God.

Malebranche had a special interest in investigating the way the Scholastics handled the problem of how an immaterial being like an angel could know material reality. He seems to have carefully studied the two modes of angelic cognition described by Suárez: the *empiricist* (deriving knowledge from the object itself, in particular the material object) and the *innatist* (deriving knowledge from the mind, or infused into the mind). These two modes are sub-classified into passive empiricist, active empiricist, active innatist and passive innatist. Malebranche disapproved of the first three, and partially approved of the fourth, which became the starting point of his own explanation of how the soul acquires its knowledge, through vision in God. To examine the four modes of cognition:

First, the *passive empiricist*: the reception of ideas of objects from the objects themselves. The ideas of things distinct from ourselves cannot come to our minds from the bodies they represent, because of the disproportion between immaterial soul and material body.[43]

Second, the *active empiricist*: the production of the ideas by the soul itself, stimulated by the impressions that the objects make on the body. This postulates a power which the soul does not possess, namely, that of creation. (Suárez discusses the active and the passive varieties together.)

Third, the *active innatist*, or innate ideas produced by the mind. The ideas are modifications of the soul's substance. But the soul's substance is finite and does not (like the divine substance) reflect all of reality in itself.[44]

Fourth, the *passive innatist*: the infusion, by divine power, of the ideas in the mind at the moment of its creation. This is accepted for

43 *De angelis* 2: 6: 9, 10, 12 [2: 127-128].

44 *De angelis* 2: 7: 4-5 [2: 135-136]; *De angelis* 2: 7: 1 [2: 138].

angelic cognition by Suárez, but is judged inadequate even for human cognition by Malebranche.[45] Only vision in God suffices.

Descartes believed that innate ideas provided, for objects of knowledge, a secure basis independent of sense experience. But to ground that knowledge, sets of innate principles were required to be multiplied by the number of humans. Malebranche thought this process needlessly redundant, and argued that it was more efficient to "see all things in God" and that consequently there be a single set of eternal ideas accessible to all. Descartes's radical distinction between concepts (such as mathematical ideas) and sensations (taken as strictly mental) had enabled the Oratorian ontologist to place the concepts in God and to retain the sensations in human minds.

3. Vision in God

To repeat: the only reasonable explanation of our ideas, according to Malebranche, is that "we see all things in God."[46] The vision in God takes the place of the Cartesian *cogito* as the foundation of philosophy. The light that illuminates thought is the presence, not of the soul to itself, but of God to the soul. The soul's clear and distinct ideas are really the divine archetypal ideas.

The only medium capable of representing all things to the mind is the divine essence. The idea of being-in-general, therefore, is the divine essence, universal being, in so far as it represents all beings to the mind in one all-inclusive perception. God has in Himself "the ideas of all things which He has created; for otherwise He could not have produced them."[47] Further, He is present to us in so intimate a manner that "one can say that He is the place of spirits, in the same way as spaces are in a sense the place of bodies."[48] It follows, therefore, accord-

45 *De angelis* 2: 6: 14 & *De angelis* 2: 7: 11 [2: 129 &138].

46 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk 3, part 2, ch. 6. Vol. 1, p. 437. Title of chapter: Que nous voyons toutes choses en Dieu.

47 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk.3, pt.2 ch.6. Vol. I, p. 437: Pour la bien comprendre, il faut souvenir... qu'il est absolument necessaire que Dieu ait en luy-même les idées de toutes les choses qu'il a crées, puisqu'autrement il n'auroit pas pû les produire... Quoted by Connell, p. 208.

48 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 6.. Vol. I, p. 447: Il faut de plus sçavoir, que Dieu est tres-étroitement uni à nos ames par sa présence, de sorte qu'on peut dire qu'il est le lieu des esprits, de même que les espaces sont le lieu des corps. Quoted by Connell, p. 208.

ing to Malebranche, that the mind can see in God the works of God provided that He wills to reveal to it the ideas which represent them. "It must be, then, that all our ideas are in the efficacious substance of the divinity, which alone is intelligible or capable of illuminating us, because it alone can affect our intelligences."[49]

Malebranche insists that in seeing all things in God we do not see His essence in itself. "The essence of God is His absolute being, and minds do not at all see the divine substance taken absolutely, but only as relative to creatures or as participable by them."[50] What they see is the divine intellect as contemplating the created perfections represented by the divine ideas. Malebranche thus tries to avoid the accusation that he is attributing the Beatific Vision, reserved for souls in heaven, to all men without distinction, and that he is naturalizing it. But the distinction between the divine essence in itself and as externally participable by creatures is a distinction without a difference, given that there is no division, in the eminent simplicity of God's being, between absolute essence and the panorama of the imitable perfections reflected in His essence.

Vision in God, however, is not the source of all our knowledge. In that vision, we only know the eternal truths, the intelligible extension as archetype of the material world (but not individual material things), and the natural moral law (through the inclination towards God we receive from His will).[51] Other sources of our knowledge are consciousness, conjecture and revelation. *Consciousness* is our source of knowledge of the soul; "we know of our soul only what we perceive to take place in us."[52] *Conjecture* is our mode of knowing other men

49 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 6, Vol. I, p. 442 : Donc il est necessaire que toutes nos idées se trouvent dans la substance efficace de la Divinité, qui seul n'est intelligible ou capable de nous éclairer, que parce qu'elle seu le peut affecter les intelligences.

50 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 6, Vol. I, p. 439 : L'essence de Dieu c'est son être absolu, et les esprits ne voyent point la substance divine prise absolument, mais seulement en-tant que relative aux créatures ou participables par elles.

51 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 6, Vol. I, p. 447.

52 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 7, sec. 4, Vol. I, p. 451. Nous ne sçavons de nôtre ame, que ce que nous sentons se passer en nous.

and angels, but certain knowledge, outside the vision of God, of other souls, minds or bodies, is only through *revelation*.[53]

III. SPINOZA'S MONISM

1. Categories: Spinoza and Descartes

Spinoza's philosophy owes Descartes both its basic ideas and a method in which to work them into a consistent system. The French Catholic had a powerful effect on the formative years of a Portuguese Jew settled in Holland. Descartes's *Principia philosophiae* (1644) was the book he used to write his own expository and critical analysis of Cartesian philosophy; the *Principia philosophiae cartesianae* (1663); it was the only work to which he ever set his name.[54]

Cartesianism gave Spinoza a model of a closely knit and systematically developed philosophy. Method for Spinoza meant the logical deduction of propositions from definitions expressing clear and distinct ideas, thus providing an explanatory account of the world. For such a method, alleged to be "geometrical," causal relation was akin to the relation of logical implication. The order of ideas corresponds to the order of causes. The logical deduction of conclusions from the appropriate set of definitions and axioms is both metaphysical deduction and knowledge of reality.

Spinoza's basic ideas make up his philosophy of monism—the doctrine identifying reality with a single divine substance—a philosophy conditioned by the Cartesian ontology of substance and its properties, with the properties divided into attributes and modes. Descartes defined *substance* (in the Suarezian manner) as "thing that exists in such a way as to depend on no other thing for its existence."[55] As this definition literally applies to God alone, it led Spinoza to monism, and convinced some thinkers that Spinozism was the result of a logical and consistent re-thinking of Cartesianism itself. Connected with substance are *attributes*, basic ways of being, or properties that are conceived through

53 Malebranche, *Recherche*, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 7, sec. 5., Vol. I, p. 454.

54 References to and quotations of Spinoza's works are taken from *Spinoza. Complete Works*. Translations by Samuel Shirley. Edited Michael L. Morgan. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 2002. References to pages of book.

55 Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, no. 51. *CSM* vol. I, p. 210.

themselves; and *modes* are things conceived through other things and are in something else.[56] Modes play a greater part in Spinoza's philosophy than in Descartes's; they are of two kinds, thought and extension. Modes of thought (like my mind and its ideas) presuppose the principal attribute of thought; modes of extension (like my body and its states) presuppose the principal attribute of extension. To every mode under the attribute of extension there corresponds a mode under the attribute of thought. This second mode Spinoza calls an "idea." Thus to every extended thing there corresponds an idea. "The order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things."[57]

Spinoza's rigorously organized system has other classifications which it shares with the Cartesian and Scholastic philosophies, including the Suarezian theory of distinctions—real, modal and conceptual. In *Cogitata metaphysica* (*Metaphysical Thoughts*, chapter 6), Spinoza notes that the real distinction intervenes between things which can be conceived apart from each other and can therefore exist apart, such as thought and extension, or the parts of matter; that the distinction of reason is that which occurs between substance and attributes, but can also be a verbal distinction; and that the modal distinction is that which obtains between substance and its mode or between two modes of the same substance.

Another Scholastic (and Cartesian) classification adopted by Spinoza is that between a thing's essence, properties and accidents. "I say that there pertains to the *essence* of a thing," writes Spinoza, "that which, when granted, the thing is necessarily posited, and by the annulling of which the thing is necessarily annulled; or that without which the thing can neither be nor be conceived, and, vice versa, that which cannot be or be conceived without the thing."[58]

The *properties* of a thing are qualities that derive from and do not strictly constitute the essence of a thing. *Accidents* are qualities that do not follow from the essence a thing.

---

56 Carlos Noreña, "Suárez and Spinoza: the Metaphysics of Modal Being," *Cuadernos salmantinos de filosofía* 12 (1985), pp. 163-182.

57 Spinoza, *Ethics,* Part II, proposition 7, p. 247.

58 Spinoza, *Ethics,* Part II, definition 2, p. 244. Ad essentiam alicuius rei id pertinere dico, quo dato res necessario ponitur, et quo sublato res necessario tollitur; vel id, sine quo res, et vice-versa quod sine re, nec esse nec concipi potest.

2. Spinoza's dyad or triad of categories

As Spinoza's thinking evolved (beyond Descartes) so did his categories, conditioned by the preeminent idea of his philosophy: that there is only one substance, the infinite divine substance identified with nature, *Deus sive natura*. For the Jewish monist "Nothing exists but substance and its modes, and modes are nothing but affections of God's attributes."[59]

All things that are, are either in themselves (substance) or in something else (modes). The Aristotelian categorial classification of substance and accident is replaced by that of substance and mode. Accident is nothing more than a mode of thinking, inasmuch as it denotes only a relation (*respectum*). This substance-mode dyad is elaborated into a triad, of substance-attributes-modes.

Spinoza defines substance, the first member of the triad as follows: "By substance I understand that which is in itself and is conceived through itself, that is to say, the conception of which does not require the conception of another thing from which it has to be formed."[60]

Suárez had noted the two senses of substance, the absolute (subsistence by itself) and the relative (substratum of accidents). Descartes hesitated between these two senses, and was never able to completely discard them. As for Spinoza, he still held the substratum theory in 1663, in his *Principia philosophiae cartesianae*, where he offered the Cartesian definition of substance as a subject of accidents. But in that very year he announced his intention of replacing the terminology of substance-accident with that of substance-mode. In the *Ethica* the term "Accident" (capitalized) was never used, and the concept of substance as the material cause of accidents and the subject of inhesion was abandoned.

For Suárez, substance is what supports itself and can support something else. But in its truer meaning it is what exists in itself and by itself. Therefore the most perfect significance of substance is found in God, who in the highest degree exists in Himself and by Himself, even though He does not stand under accidents. The perfection of

59 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part 1, proposition 28, Proof, p. 233. Praeter substantiam et modos nihil datur, et modi sunt Dei attributorum affectiones.

60 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, definition 3, p. 217. Per substantiam intelligo id, quod in se est, et per se concipitur; hoc est id, cuius conceptus non indiget conceptu alterius rei, a quo formari debeat.

the divine substance is then expressed in a more explicit manner in its attributes.

Spinoza defines the second member of the triad as follows (somewhat differently from Suárez): "By attribute I mean that which the intellect perceives of substance as constituting its essence."[61]

"By the name 'attribute' Suárez understands every predicate which applies to God after the constitution of His metaphysical essence properly described... an attribute is every predicate which is appropriate to God after His metaphysical essence strictly defined is fully constituted, howsoever it be applied to Him, so long as it is not applied metaphorically. Except the predicate 'being itself' and the like, all the rest are attributes".[62]

Spinoza argues that "The more reality or being a thing has, the more attributes it has."[63] An infinite being must therefore have an infinity of attributes, as Spinoza's god is said to do. Each of these attributes is for its part infinite; and of these infinite attributes two are known to us, thought and extension.

Attributes introduce the element of difference in what is said to be a unitary being. The difference does not, according to Spinoza, essentially affect the unity, for "whatever can be perceived by the infinite intellect as constituting the essence of substance pertains entirely to the one sole substance. Consequently, thinking substance and extended

61 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, definition 4, p. 217. Per attributum intelligo id, quod intellectus de substantia percipit, tanquam eius essentiam constituens.

62 José Hellin, *Theologia naturalis*, Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1950, p. 400: Suárez intelligit nomine attributi omne praedicatum quod Deo convenit post constitutam eius essentiam metaphysicam proprie dictam, licet illud praedicatum sit positivum vel negativum, absolutum vel relativum, temporale vel aeternum, liberum vel necessarium; et ideo etiam praedicata intelligens, vivens, etc., possent sub nomine attributi includi in libro *de Trinitate*, licet forte in libro *de Deo Uno* inclinet ad dicendum praedicata vivens, spirituale et intelligens non esse attributa sed praedicata essentialia, pertinentia nempe ad essentiam metaphysicam improprie constitutam. Nos simpliciter dicimus attributum esse omne praedicatum quod Deo convenit post constitutam plene essentiam metaphysicam stricte dictam, quomodocumque ei conveniat, dummodo non ei conveniat metaphorice. Excepto praedicato ipsum esse et similibus, cetera omnia sunt attributa.

63 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part 1, proposition 9, p. 221.

substance are one and the same substance, comprehended now under this attribute, now under that."[64]

Spinoza defines the third member of the triad as follows (not very differently from Suárez): "By mode I mean the affections of a substance, that is, that which is in something else and is conceived through something else."[65]

The modes of a substance depend on that substance through its attributes. The divine attributes can be considered either in their absolute nature or as affected by some modes. These modes are infinite and finite. (But this raises the question as to how an infinite being, which is infinite in every way, can come to have finite modes.) The modes that depend on or are conceived through the attribute of thought are called modes of thought, and the modes that depend on or are conceived through the attribute of extension are called modes of extension. Finite minds are modes of God under the attribute of thought, and finite bodies are modes of God under the attribute of extension. In Spinoza's words,

> a mode of extension and the idea of that mode are one and the same thing, expressed in two ways... as long as things are considered as modes of thought, we must explicate the order of the whole of Nature, or the connection of causes, through the attribute of thought alone; and insofar as things are considered as modes of extension, again the order of the whole of Nature must be explicated through the attribute of extension only. The same applies to other attributes.[66]

---

64 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part II, proposition 7, Scholium, p 247: quidquid ab infinito intellectu percipi potest tanquam substantiae essentiam constituens, id omne ad unicam tantum substantiam pertinet, et consequenter quod substantia cogitans et substantia extensa una eademque est substantia, quae iam sub hoc, iam sub illo attributo comprehenditur. Sic etiam modus extensionis et idea illius modi una eademque est res, sed duobus modis expressa... ideo, sive Naturam sub attributo Extensionis, sive sub attributo Cogitationis, sive sub alio quocunque concipiamus, unum eundemque ordinem, sive unam eandemque causarum connexionem, hoc est easdem res, sive causarum connexionem, per solum Cogitationis attributum explicare debemus; et quatenus ut modi Extensionis considerantur, ordo etiam totius Naturae per solum Extensionis attributum explicari debet; et idem de aliis attributis intelligo.

65 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, definition 5, p. 217. Per modum intelligo substantiae affectiones, sive id, quod in alio est, per quod etiam concipitur.

66 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part II, proposition 7, Scholium, p. 247.

"The modes of any attribute have God as their cause only insofar as he is considered under that attribute, and not insofar as he is considered under any other attribute."[67]

3. Modes (*natura naturata*)

Modes are the main prop of Spinoza's monism; he believed that they could help him reconcile manifold reality with the unique divine being. However, as harmonizers of Difference with Identity, the differentiators introduce such a complexity of classifications, as to encumber and dissipate rather than reinforce and integrate, unity. Modes are the problem rather than the solution. There was a time, however, when Spinoza, still under the influence of Descartes, rejected the use of modes. In chapter 5 of *Principia philosophiae cartesianae* he argued that there are no modes in God, as "modes arise from an alteration of substance."[68]

But even when modes became the corner stone of Spinozism, its founder sometimes denied their existence. He observed that the definition of modes, insofar as it is not itself a definition of substance, cannot involve existence. Therefore, even when they exist, we can conceive of modes as not existing.[69]

Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz evidently derive their knowledge of modes from Suárez. But for Suárez modes are signs of contingency and finitude; they actualize possibilities, and as such are incompatible with the perfection of the divine substance which is Pure Actuality. Contrariwise, for Spinoza, modes are the necessary emanations or expressions, infinite in number, of an infinite perfection which is *diffusivum sui*. Suarezian imperfection parallels Spinozan perfection.

Spinoza apparently exploits Suárez's nuanced language, which describes a mode both as something "positive" and as "not properly a thing or entity."[70] A thing and its mode are sometimes spoken of as "the

67 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part II, proposition 6, p. 246. Cuiuscumque attributi modi Deum, quatenus tantum sub illo attributo, cuius modi sunt, et non quatenus sub ullo alio consideratur, pro causa habent.

68 Spinoza, *Principles of Cartesian Philosophy and Metaphysical Thoughts* [1663]. *Appendix Containing Metaphysical Thoughts*, Part II, chapter 5, p. 196.

69 Spinoza, Letter 12 to Lodewiyk Meyer, April 20, 1663, p. 788.

70 *DM* 7: 1: 19 [25: 257]: non proprie est res seu entitas.

same reality" or as two aspects of reality different from each other before any discriminating operation of the intellect. Spinoza found this seeming hesitancy of language ideally suited to express his impossible goal of reconciling the pluralism of common sense and the monism of his metaphysics.

As substance is prior to its modes, modes cannot be individuators of substances, which are individual by their own entity. But, as in the case of substances a and b, if we ignore modes, we will have no way to distinguish those substances; so we may conclude that a equals b. However, if we allow substance to be further individuated by its modes, then we are not considering that substance truly, in itself, but in another (its mode).

At all events, the question arises, why are modes necessary? Why must substance express itself in modes? In a monist philosophy like Spinoza's everything happens of necessity, for "in the nature of things nothing contingent is granted, but all things are determined by the necessity of divine nature for existing and working in a certain way."[71] Again, "things could not have been produced by God in any other manner or order than that in which they were produced."[72] In other words, "infinite things in infinite modes must necessarily follow from the necessity of divine nature."[73]

So Spinoza merely assumes that substance must have modes; and draws the conclusion that as substance is infinite its modes must be infinite. God or nature necessarily expresses itself in modifications, and so is the immanent cause of all its modifications or modes. Yet God does not exist apart from the modes and cannot interfere with the chain of causes. All things exist in God or nature: "God is the indwelling and not the transient cause of all things."[74] It is not empirical nature that is identified with God, but nature as the infinite substance that lies behind the transitory modes. In the logical process of deduction from the infinite substance, Spinoza proceeds first to the infinite and eternal modes and then to the finite ones. But there is the strange admission that the infinite God of necessity also produces finite modes identical with his infinite being.

---

71 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, proposition 29, p. 234.

72 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, proposition 33, p. 235.

73 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, proposition 16, p. 227.

74 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, proposition 18, p. 229.

How are modes classified? One classification is into *infinite* and *finite*. Modes are expressions of attributes; and attributes can be considered in their absolute nature, unconditioned by any mode, or as conditioned by some mode, infinite or finite. The infinite and eternal mode follows from the absolute nature of some attribute of God, expressive of infinity and necessity of existence. It is directly produced by God and constitutes the primary things.

The primary things then act as a medium to produce finite modes. [The question remains: how could an infinite God, qualified by infinite modes, give rise to any mode that is finite? How can God, infinite in essence and attributes, and perfect in being, produce modes that are finite and imperfect in essence, identical with His being, which thus becomes an aggregate of infinite and finite modes, the latter kind limiting his perfection.] Technically, an infinite mode, consisting of an infinite series of finite causes and effects, may also be understood as infinite substance or nature, which has no external cause.

Another classification of modes is into *immediate* and *mediate*. To clarify the difference between these modes, let us take the mode of the attribute of thought. The immediate mode is "absolutely infinite understanding." The mediate mode is the total system of minds. "It is clear… that our mind, insofar as it understands, is an eternal mode of thinking, which is determined by another eternal mode of thinking, and this again by another, and so on ad infinitum, with the result that they all together constitute the eternal and infinite intellect of God."[75]

4. God (*Natura naturans*)

God's being, as Suárez visualizes it, "essentially includes existence itself that is entirely independent and from itself, when however, contrariwise, in the creature, the character of being is totally dependent and from another."[76] From this entitatively independent being Suárez deduces the divine attributes a priori. God's entitative independence was one of two of Suárez's ideas that Spinoza borrowed to develop his idea of God (totally alien to that of Suárez), the other being the concept of substance. Spinoza's God is not the Aristotelian Unmoved Mover of the cosmos, or the Thomist Pure Act of a Being free from any po-

75 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part V, proposition 40, Scholium, p. 381.

76 *DM* 28: 3: 8 [26: 15]: includit essentialiter ipsum esse omnino independens et a se, cum tamen e contrario in creatura ipsamet ratio entis sit omnino pendens et ab alio.

tentiality; or the Biblical Creator of a contingent universe outside of Himself. Spinoza's God is the Immanent Cause of itself and of all its infinite affections (or qualities), the self-actualizing infinite Power, the Necessary Ground of its infinite modes.

Though their conceptions of the Godhead differ, both Suárez and Spinoza agree that it is perfect: but the Suarezian God is a simple entity, while the Spinozan god is an intricately complicated one. Suárez speaks of God's perfection in these words:

> as God is from Himself, thus from Himself has all the perfection that is due to Him. From which superior can He have it, since He Himself is the supreme being? He therefore has it independently of all other beings, and therefore cannot be deprived of all the perfection that is His due. Neither can He deprive Himself of it, because every thing naturally desires and retains the perfection due to itself, unless it is deprived of it by some other more powerful. And then [too there can be no deprivation] mostly because God does not have this perfection effectively (through causal activity) but formally and negatively, because though He does not have it from another, He does so from the formal eminence of His nature.[77]

When speaking of God's perfection it is particularly important to stress the attribute of simplicity, because Spinoza himself professed it early in his career, when he was strongly influenced by Descartes. The young Spinoza had maintained that there is no composition of coalescent parts in God. Each part is not by itself "God", for then it would be infinite and perfect and all the other parts would be redundant. It is only when the parts, which are postulated to exist prior to their coalescing, come together then we would have "God." But nothing is prior to God, so God cannot be the sum total of not-gods. There is too no composition of different modes in God, because modes arise from an alteration of substance, something that cannot occur in a perfect substance. Thus far the young Spinoza. But the older Spinoza needed

77 *DM* 30: 1: 2 [26: 61]: sicut Deus ex se est, ita ex se habet totam perfectionem sibi debitam. A quo enim superiori illam haberet, cum ipse sit supremum ens? Habet ergo illam independenter ab omni alio; ergo a nullo privari potest tota perfectione sibi debita. Nec vero ipse potest seipsum illa privare, tum quia omnis res naturaliter appetit et retinet perfectionem sibi debitam, nisi ab alio potentiori illa privetur; tum maxime quia Deus non habet huiusmodi perfectionem a se effective, sed formaliter seu negative, quia scilicet non habet ab alio, sed ex formali eminentia suae naturae.

a composite: God or nature as substance (*natura naturans*) infinite yet indivisible, and God or nature as modes (*natura naturata*), infinite but constituted of finite parts.

Spinoza insists that multiplicity follows from God's perfection. The essence of God "excludes all imperfection and involves absolute perfection, it thereby removes all reason for doubting his existence and affords the utmost certainty of it…"[78] And all "things have been brought into being by God with supreme perfection, since they have necessarily followed from a most perfect nature."[79]

From God's supreme power, or infinite nature, infinitely many things, in infinitely many modes—i.e. all things—have necessarily flowed, or always flow, by the same necessity and in the same way as from the nature of a triangle it follows, from eternity to eternity, that its three angles are equal to two right angles.[80] God, as envisaged by Suárez and Spinoza, is a cause; the God of Suárez produces multiple beings, contingent creatures, that are wholly other than Himself; the Spinozan god produces multiple beings, his modes, that are wholly identical with himself. It is therefore true to say that Spinoza's god is self caused, *causa sui*, an idea that Spinoza derives, not from Suárez, but from Descartes. The latter, in his *Meditations* declares that God —or "what caused me"- has "the power of existing through its own might."[81]

But Suárez clearly rejects God as *causa sui*.

> From the fact that what is said to be 'from itself' or 'through itself', though it may appear positive, it only adds a negation to the being, for being cannot be from itself through a positive origin and emanation. It is therefore said to be from itself, in so far as it has being without emanation from another; by this negation we declare the positive and simple perfection of that being, which in itself and in its essence contains existence itself in such a way that it receives it

78 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part 1, proposition 11, Scholium, p. 223.

79 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part 1, proposition 33, Scholium 2, p. 236.

80 Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I, proposition 18, Scholium, p. 228.

81 Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy, Third Meditation*. *CSM* vol. II, p. 34.

> from no one. Any entity which does not have being unless it receives it from another does not have that perfection.[82]

To return to Spinoza. We have God or nature, *Deus sive natura*, in two forms, *Natura naturans* ("naturing nature"), the creator god, substance; and *Natura naturata* ("natured nature"), the created god, modes. These forms are not distinct. There is one infinite substance; but it can be looked at from different points of view.

It would be appropriate here to repeat what we said in the previous section, about the attributes of the infinite substance—that they can be considered in their absolute nature, unconditioned by any mode; or as conditioned by some mode, infinite and eternal or finite and determined. This distinction is reflected in Spinoza's convoluted description of the emanation of the modes from God that follows:

> Whatever is determined to exist and to act has been so determined by God... But that which is finite and has a determinate existence cannot have been produced by the absolute nature of one of God's attributes, for whatever follows from the absolute nature of one of God's attributes is infinite and eternal... It must therefore have followed from God or one of his attributes insofar as that is considered as affected by some mode; for nothing exists but substance and its modes... and modes... are nothing but affections of God's attributes. But neither could a finite and determined thing have followed from God or one of his attributes insofar as that is affected by a modification which is eternal and infinite... Therefore, it must have followed, or been determined to exist and to act, by God or one of his attributes insofar as it was modified by a modification which is finite and has a determinate existence.[83]

---

82 *DM* 28: 1: 7 [26: 3]: Nam quod dicitur ex se vel a se esse, licet positivum esse videatur, tamen solam negationem addit ipsi enti, nam ens non potest esse a se per positivam originem et emanationem; dicitur ergo esse a se, quatenus, sine emanatione ab alio, habet esse, per quam negationem nos declaramus positivam et simplicem perfectionem illius entis, quod ita in se et essentia sua claudit ipsum existere, ut a nullo illud recipiat, quam perfectionem non habet illud ens, quod esse non habet, nisi illud ab alio accipiat.

83 Spinoza, *Ethics,* Part 1, proposition 28, Proof, p. 233. Quicquid determinatum est ad existendum et operandum, ad Deo sic determinatum est. At id, quod finitum est et determinatam habet existentiam, ab absoluta natura alicuius Dei attributi produci non potuit; quicquid enim ex absoluta natura alicuius Dei attributi sequitur, id infinitum et aeternum est. Debuit ergo ex Deo, vel alicuius eius attributo sequi, quatenus aliquo modo affectum consid-

Spinoza may have been hoping that the doctrine of modes would resolve the difficult problem of harmonizing manifold reality with monistic unity. But he may have realized that the solution caused more problems than it solved.

It gave rise to apparently irresoluble antinomies. The substance aspect of the Spinozan deity includes existence in its essence, but the modes aspect does not, notwithstanding its identity with the substance aspect. So we have an indivisible monistic entity which is both existent and non-existent. In addition, the substance aspect is infinitely perfect, and yet it is wholly identical with the modes aspect, which is a collection of imperfect units. Which makes our indivisible monistic entity at once perfect and imperfect.

5. Suárez's anticipated critique of Spinozism

The anomalous state of the Spinozan system is sharply focused in what may be taken as Suárez's anticipated critique of Spinoza's proof of monism. It is a very involved argument, but which, simplified, can be stated in syllogistic form as follows:

Major: God is the most perfect Being, possessed of the highest and consummate perfection [conceivably in a simple entity or in multiple entities].

Minor: But it is far more excellent to possess that highest and consummate perfection in one simple entity than through a combination of multiple entities.

Conclusion: therefore this simple manner of being has to be attributed to the first Being.

Objection: it is assumed that it is possible to have the highest perfection in a simple rather than in a composite being. It is better to possess the perfection compositively rather than not at all.

Response: it is evident that consummate perfection subsists better in a simple entity than in a composite one, for two reasons:

---

eratur; praeter enim substantiam et modos nihil datur; et modi nihil sunt nisi Dei attributorum affectiones. At ex Deo, vel aliquo eius attributo, quatenus affectum est modificatione, quae eterna et infinita est, sequi etiam non potuit. Debuit ergo sequi, vel ad existendum et operandum determinari, a Deo vel aliquo eius attributo, quatenus modificatum et modificatione quae finita est et determinatam habet existentiam... Deinde haec rursus causa, sive hic modus... debuit etiam determinari ab alia, quae finita est et determinatam habet existentiam, et rursus haec ultima... ab alia, et sic semper... in infinitum.

1. Because each of the components of the perfect being would be imperfect, as none of them taken separately would include all perfection; indeed each would be incomplete and insufficient in the category of being: and so the postulated perfection of the perfect being would be the sum total of imperfect components. [Imperfect plus imperfect cannot equal perfect, especially the absolutely perfect.] Besides, for something perfect to be made up of imperfect units is itself an imperfection.

2. The perfect being would be dependent on its components for its perfection [as it would presumably lose that perfection if the components were eliminated. And if their removal has no effect on its perfection, they would be purposelessly redundant]. To depend on another is an imperfection. Because in every composed entity, the components are partial and incomplete entities; or if one of the components is complete, the others would be incomplete [and redundant].[84]

6. The divinization of man

Spinoza completes the divinization of man which began inadvertently with Descartes. The father of modern philosophy not only makes man an angel, but starts the process by which he will become God. Simply put, man begins to think like God or act like God in thought, and eventually ends up with being god in fact.

---

84 *DM* 30: 3: 4-7 [26: 73-74]: ostensum est enim Deum esse perfectissimum ens; sed longe excellentius est habere summam et consummatam perfectionem in simplicissima entitate quam ex adunatione plurium; ergo hic modus est tribuendus primo enti. Dices, argumentum supponere esse possibile habere perfectiones in summo ac perfecto gradu in entitate simplici; hoc autem demonstratum non est, possetque aliquis illud negare, et nihilominus dicere Deum esse ens perfectissimum, quia melius est habere perfectiones cum aliqua compositione quam esse ens simplex et carere tot perfectionibus... Propter hanc enim causam quidam etiam Catholici distinctionem formalem ex natura rei inter divinas perfectiones excogitarunt. Respondetur, imo esse evidens non posse esse perfectissimum ens si ex adunatione plurium perfectionum seu rerum aut partium distinctarum coalescat. Primo, quia singula componentia essent imperfecta, tum quia nullum eorum secundum se includeret omnem perfectionem; tum etiam quia singula essent incompleta seu insufficientia in genere entis; ergo quod ex illis consurgeret, non posset esse undequaque perfectum, quia scilicet hoc ipsum, nimirum, constare ex imperfectis, est magna imperfectio. Secundum, quia tale ens esset dependens a suis componentibus. Sed dependere ab alio est imperfectio....

Descartes's man starts by being self- conscious in the way God is. There are two forms of self-consciousness, mediate or immediate. Mediate, through being aware of other things, especially external ones, and through them, reflexively, becoming aware of oneself. Immediate, through being aware of oneself directly and not through the intervention of anything else. Kant, for one, made the point that no human mind can be conscious of itself except mediately. In his words, "The consciousness of my own existence is at the same time an immediate consciousness of the existence of other things outside me."[85]

In Descartes's *cogito* however, thought attains itself not by a reflex knowledge but directly as a primary object ; such direct knowledge, the Scholastics contend, is proper to God alone. One such Scholastic, John of St. Thomas (1589-1644), argues that God does not know His essence through first knowing the creatures of which He is the cause, but rather knows the creatures subsequently through His anterior self-intellection. He writes: "because before the act of (divine) intellection is posited no other object directly known is presupposed, because nothing else that is constitutive of the divine nature is assumed; and thus, since the very act of intellection is the primary object of divine intellection itself, God knows it directly and not reflexively."[86]

---

85 Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* B 276. My quotes are taken from *Immanuel Kant'sCritique of Pure Reason*. Translated Norman Kemp Smith [NKS]. London : Macmillan, 1929.

86 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus. In Primam Partem Divi Thomae commentarii*. Solesmes Benedictines [eds.]. Paris: Desclée, vol. 2, 1934. Disp. 15, art. 3, n. 28, pp. 273-274: Ad primam probationem, dicitur verum esse, quod Deus ante suum intelligere non supponitur esse causa creaturarum: quia per ipsum intelligere constituitur in ratione causae, immo in ipso suo esse naturae divinae., ut infra... ostendetur; sed quia intelligit Deus ipsum suum intelligere tamquam obiectum sui, eo quod in Deo idem est obiectum intelligibile et intellectio, ideo si est causa per suum intelligere, per causam cognoscit creaturas: quia ipsum intelligere obiectum eius est; et sicut cognoscit suam essentiam, quae consistit in ipso intelligere, tamquam rem cognitam, etiam cognoscit illam ut causam creaturarum, quia vere sic est. Nec tamen hoc [> 274] facit per reflexam cognitionem, quia ante ipsum intelligere [divinum] non praesupponitur aliud obiectum directe cognitum, quia non praesupponitur aliud quo constituatur natura divina; et ita cum sit primum obiectum divinae intellectionis ipsummet intelligere, non reflexe, sed directe ipsum cognoscit.

The divinization of man is carried further by Malebranche, who confers on the human mind the ability (through its natural powers and without the elevation of grace) to see God—or His act of intellection—even outside the Beatific Vision. This act becomes accessible to the human mind in a connatural manner, as it is to God. It mirrors all of reality, for "it is absolutely necessary that God should have in Himself the ideas of all the things He has created, since otherwise He would not have been able to produce them."[87]

Spinoza completes this divinization. Man is divine not merely in his thought, but in substance, for the human mind is part of the infinite intellect of God...[88] and so gets its ideas in God himself. The empiricists, for their part, never abandoned humanity, though it was for some more merely mammal than human. Kant will restore humanity to man, but of a restricted kind.

This process of divinization can in no way be said to have been initiated by Suárez, who clearly declared that "in this life we in some fashion know our soul up to its specific difference, yet we do not know it quidditatively… because we do not conceive it through its proper substance and species, nor do we sufficiently ascertain its manner of knowing and working, and neither do we apprehend its kind of substance positively…but through a negation."[89] Not an auspicious beginning for a process of divinization!

IV. LEIBNIZ'S MONADISM

87 Malebranche, *Recherche bk 3: part 2: ch. 6*. Rodis-Lewis ed. Vol. 1, p. 437: Pour la bien comprendre, il faut se souvenir... qu'il est absolument nécessaire que Dieu ait en lui-même les idées de toutes les êtres qu'il a crées, puisqu'autrement il n'auroit pas pû les produire, & qu'ainsi il voit tous ces êtres en considérant les perfections qu'il renferme auxquelles ils ont rapport.

88 Spinoza, *Ethics,* Part II, proposition 11, Corollary.

89 *DM* 35: 3: 3 [26:440]: in hac vita cognoscimus animam nostram usque ad eius differentiam specificam aliquo modo, et tamen non cognoscimus quidditative… quia non concipimus illam per propriam substantiam et speciem, nec modum intelligendi aut operandi eius satis perspicimus, nec denique modum substantiae eius positive… sed per negationem apprehendimus.

1. *Cogitabilitas*

As we have so often noted, evidently for the first time in Scholastic philosophy, Suárez made the ascertainment of objective or extra-mental reality dependent on our intra-mental knowledge [or "cogitation," not his word] of it. Postulating, as a universal principle, that "to one formal concept one objective concept corresponds of necessity"[90]—he declared that we can prove the unity (of the objective concept) of being by ascertaining the nature of its correspondent formal concept. He noted that intra-mental consciousness is more accessible to us (*nobis notius*) than extra-mental reality, as the acts of consciousness are produced "by us and in us" (*a nobis et in nobis*).

Extra-mental reality always has the primacy, and the truth known to consciousness still needs to conform to it. Yet, when the latter becomes difficult to ascertain, like the vexing problem of the unity of being, recourse to consciousness, which is *experientia notior*, may provide the solution.

Descartes emphatically agreed with Suárez, declaring "that it is not a fiction, but a truth that should not be denied by anyone, that there is nothing which is completely in our power apart from our own thoughts."[91] It was Descartes who raised mental "cogitation" to a new level of importance by seeking to infer (*ergo*) the truth of the extra-mental reality "I am" (*sum*) from the better-known (*notior*), indeed in-

90 *DM* 2: 2: 3 [25: 70]: uni conceptui formali unus conceptus obiectivus necessario respondet; sed ostensum est dari unum conceptum formalem entis; ergo necessario dandus est unus obiectivus. Maior constat, quia conceptus formalis habet totam suam rationem et unitatem ab obiecto; ergo, ut sit unus, necesse est ut tendat in obiectum aliquo modo unum; sed conceptus obiectivus nihil aliud est quam obiectum ipsum, ut cognitum vel apprehensum per talem conceptum formalem; ergo, si conceptus formalis est unus, necesse est ut obiectivus etiam unus sit.

91 Descartes, Letter to Anonymous [said to be Henri Reneri, 1593-1639] of March 1638, *Oeuvres et lettres de Descartes. Textes présentés par André Bridone*. Paris: Gallimard, 1953, pp. 1001-1002: Il ne me semble point que ce soit une fiction, mais une vérité, qui ne doit point être niée de personne, qu'il n'y a rien qui soit entièrement en notre pouvoir que nos pensées ; au moins en prenant le mot de pensée comme je fais, pour toutes les opérations de l'âme, en sorte que non seulement les méditations et les volontés, mais même les fonctions de voir, d'ouïr, de se déterminér à un mouvement plutôt qu'a un autre, etc., en tant qu'elles dépendent d'elle, sont des pensées.

dubitable, intra-mental consciousness, expressed as "I think" (*cogito*, I "cogitate").

Finally, the primacy of cogitation in metaphysics (and the concomitant identification of reality in general with possibility) was finally affirmed by Leibniz. Essence was seen to be equivalent to reality, and the latter to possibility. Leibniz's formulation could not be more categorical: *nihil aliud est realitas quam cogitabilitas*,[92] "reality is nothing else but conceivability/thinkability (or the ability to 'cogitate')."

2. Innate ideas

Rationalism, as Leibniz well understood, is innatist, and the Rationalists we discuss in this work are all innatists of one sort or another. The theory that man's mind knows through innate ideas (and not from ideas derived from objects) seems to have been inspired by Descartes's angelism, for, as the Scholastics claimed, angels know through innate ideas. But two Rationalists, Spinoza and Malebranche, do not speak of innate ideas, and do not need to, for they had modes of cognition superior not only to the human but also to the angelic. For monotheists like Descartes and Leibniz, man is inferior to the angels, and the infusion of the superior angelic mode of knowing into the inferior human mind elevates the latter. Even more elevated are the Malebranchian and Spinozan types of divine cognition, which provide a direct vision of the divine, with the difference that the Malebranchian knower is creaturely, while the Spinozan knower is divine. So while the ideas in the Cartesian and Leibnizian minds are akin to those of angels, the ones in the Malebranchian and Spinozan mind are godly or have access to God: but all are innate.

Descartes's innate ideas were ready-made in the mind, propositions with clear ideational content, independent of experience. This innatism was attacked by the empiricists like Locke, who insisted on the centrality of sense experience in human knowledge. This knowledge, they contended, was not just there in the human mind but was rather a product of the mind's activity working on the materials furnished by experience. Locke was prepared to allow that the human mind had predispositions to some states of behavior and not to others, and even that ideas or principles were tacitly present as dispositions or capacities; but he refused to admit that there were any clearly formulated

92 L. Couturat (ed), *Opuscules et fragments inédits*. Paris 1903, p. 22.

propositions. The Lockian critique had a profound influence on Leibniz, who was forced to re-think the whole Rationalist position on innatism.

Innate ideas, wrote Leibniz, are *virtually* innate, meaning that the mind has the power of finding these ideas in itself. The Scholastics, who like the empiricists insisted on the importance of sense experience in human knowledge, had an axiom that there was nothing in the intellect which had not previously been in the senses. *Nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensu, excipe, nisi ipse intellectus*, countered Leibniz: "there is nothing in the intellect which had not been in the senses, except the intellect itself."[93] Some ideas, as is evidenced by the proposition "the sweet is not bitter", are derived from sensation and are due to the action of external things or the sense organs. They refer to phenomena and spatial externality, and cannot be said to be truly innate. But other ideas are derived from the mind itself, and not from the external senses, like the ideas of squareness and circularity. Again, "the soul comprises being, substance, unity, identity, cause, perception, reason and many other notions which the senses cannot give."[94] These ideas are derived from reflection and are thus innate. In the proposition, the square is not a circle, the principle of contradiction, which is an innate truth of reason, is applied to ideas derived from the mind itself and not from the senses; it is applied, in short, to innate ideas. Applying the principle of contradiction to a truth derived from the senses—"the sweet is not bitter"—does not make it innate.

Leibniz concluded: "Thus it is that ideas and truths are for us innate as inclinations, habits or natural propensities and not as actions,

93 Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essaies,* vol. 5 of C. I. Gerhardt (ed.), *Die philosophischen Schriften von* G. W. *Leibniz*, 7 vol. 1875-1890; the present reference is to livre II, chapitre 1, sect. 2, vol. 5, p. 100.

94 Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais,* vol. 5 of C. I. Gerhardt (ed.), *Die philosophischen Schriften von* G. W. *Leibniz*, 7 vol. 1875-1890; [abbreviated to G + vol. number] the present reference is to G 5, p. 100: Cela étant, peut-on nier qu'il y a beaucoup d'inné en notre esprit, puisque nous somme innés, pour ainsi dire, à nous mêmes ? Et qu'il y a en nous mêmes être, unité, substance, durée, changement, action, perception, plaisir, et mille autres objets des nos idées intellectuelles?

although these potentialities are always accompanied by some actions, often insensible, which corresponds to them."[95]

3. Substance and modes

Like many early modern philosophers, Leibniz derives his ideas of substance and modes from Suárez, but Leibnizian substance has moved far away from the Suarezian. It is to begin with, a being capable of action. Declares Leibniz: "I hold that naturally a substance cannot exist without action."[96] Substance as the primary source of such action in bodies and the principle of unity in organisms is described as substantial form.

Suárez is not averse to the idea of an active substance, since he maintains that "to have the power to act is not repugnant to created things, but rather is in the highest degree conformable to their perfection; therefore, as God will create each thing perfect in its nature, it is not to be denied that He created such things, which had the connatural power to act."[97] Indeed, "created agents truly and properly produce effects connatural and proportional to themselves."[98] But Suárez does not make activity central to his notion of substance.

For Leibniz, a substance cannot develop its potentialities, that is, pass from one state to another, while remaining the same subject, unless it has an inner tendency to self-development or self-unfolding:

> If things were so formed by the mandate (of God) as to render them fit to accomplish the will of the legislator, then it must be admitted

95 Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais sur l'Entendement par l'Auteur du Système de l'Harmonie Preétablie,* Preface. G 5, p. 45: Et c'est ainsi que les idées et les vérités nous sont innées, comme des inclinations, des dispositions, des habitudes ou des virtualités naturelles, et non pas comme des actions, quoique ces virtualités soient toujours accompagnés de quelques actions souvent insensibles qui y répondent.

96 Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais sur l'Entendement par l'Auteur du Système de l'Harmonie Preétablie,* Preface. G 5, p. 46: je soutiens que naturellement une substance ne saurait être sans action.

97 *DM* 18: 1: 8 [25: 595]: habere vim agendi non repugnat rebus creatis, sed potius est maxime consentaneum perfectioni earum; ergo, cum Deus condiderit unamquamque rem in natura sua perfectam, negandum non est tales creasse res, quae habeant connaturalem virtutem agendi.

98 *DM* 18: 1: 5 [25: 594]: Dicendum tamen est primo, agentia creata vere ac proprie efficere effectus sibi connaturales et proportionales.

> that a certain efficacy, form or force… was impressed on things from which proceeds the series of phenomena according to the prescription of the first command.[99]

Activity, then, is essential to substance; "the activity of substance is rather of metaphysical necessity and would have had a place… in any system whatever."[100]

The notion of active substance is the first difference between the Suarezian and Leibnizian substances. A second difference is that the former is dyadic (nature+subsistence) and the later is monadic (nature=subsistence). Suárez writes:

> God alone is a complete substance without any composition. This God is indeed a substance in reality complete, because it [the divine substance] is by itself essentially subsisting, and of itself needs no one for the consummate and absolute perfection of substance…[101] But in creatures a complete substance is never found without real composition. A created substance complete in reality is one composed of a complete nature and its ultimate terminus [that is, subsistence], or composed of many or all incomplete substances, which it needs so that it be consummate in its existence.[102]

---

99 Leibniz, *De ipsa natura sive de vita actionibusque creaturarum, pro dynamicis suis confirmandis illustrandisque*. G 4, p. 507: Sin vero lex a Deo lata relinquit aliquod sui expressum in rebus vestigium, si res ita fuere formatae mandato, ut aptae redderentur ad implendam iubentis voluntatem, iam concedendum est, quandam inditam esse rebus efficaciam, formam vel vim, qualis naturae nomine a nobis accipi solet, ex qua series phaenomenorum ad primi iussus praescriptum consequeretur.

100 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel zwischen Leibniz und de Volder*, 1698-1706, Letter of Leibniz to Volder, G 2, p. 169: Substantiae tamen activitas magis est metaphysicae necessitatis, et locum ni fallor habitura erat in systemate quocumque.

101 *DM* 33: 1: 8 [26: 332]: Solus Deus est substantia completa et sine ulla compositione. Est enim hic Deus substantia reipsa completa, quia per seipsam est essentialiter subsistens, et ex se non indiget aliquo ad consummatam et absolutam substantiae perfectionem.

102 *DM* 33:1:8 [26: 332]. At vero in creaturis nunquam reperitur substantia completa sine reali compositione. Substantia creata in reipsa completa est illa quae composita est ex completa natura et ultimo eius termino [id est, subsistentia], seu quae constat et componitur pluribus vel omnibus substantiis incompletis, quibus indiget ut in suo esse sit consummata.

In short, *nulla est substantia creata omnino simplex.*[103]

Suárez is emphatic about the dyadic character (nature-suppositum) of (created) substance:

> We gather that the created suppositum adds something positively real to nature, and in reality distinct from it. If we compare the suppositum with nature, they are distinguished as including and included, for suppositum includes nature, and adds something which can be called personality, suppositality, or created subsistence, but nature prescinds from this addition or from subsistence.[104]

The dyadic character of substance is highlighted by the fact that for Suárez nature and subsistence can be separated:

> It follows that, through absolute possibility, nature can be conserved without subsistence, but the whole suppositum cannot be conserved without nature, which includes it formally, and by it is essentially constituted in the being of such a substance.[105]

However, the separated nature is individuated by its own entity and not by its superadded subsistence.

> The individuation of nature is not in reality anything distinct from nature, but personality [or subsistence] is in reality distinct in such a way, as to be also separable….[106] Furthermore, incommunicable subsistence belongs to the intrinsic significance of the suppositum as such, but no subsistence belongs to the significance of individual created nature; therefore the individuation of such a nature is not

---

103 *DM* 35: 1: 12 [26: 430].

104 *DM* 34: 2: 40 [26: 359]: Colligitur suppositum creatum addere naturae aliquod reale positivum, et in reipsa distinctum ab illa. Si comparemus suppositum ad naturam, distinguuntur tanquam includens et inclusum; nam suppositum includit naturam, et aliquod addit, quod personalitas, suppositalitas, aut subsistentia creata appellari potest; natura vero praescindit ab hoc addito seu a subsistentia.

105 *DM* 34: 2: 20 [26: 359]: Quo fit ut natura possit de potentia absoluta sine subsistentia conservari, suppositum autem totum non possit conservari sine natura, quia illam formaliter includit, et per illam in esse talis substantiae essentialiter constituitur. ...

106 *DM* 34: 3: 3 [26: 360]: Individuatio naturae non est in re aliquid distinctum a natura; personalitas vero ita est in re distincta, ut sit etiam separabilis. ...

> its subsistence; therefore individuation is not what a suppositum adds to nature.[107]

A third difference between the Suarezian and the Leibnizian substance is that the latter is a subject which virtually contains all the attributes that will ever be predicated of it: "we may say that the nature of an individual substance or complete being is to have a notion so complete that it suffices to comprehend, and to render deducible from it, all the predicates of the subject to which this notion is attributed."[108] In "saying that the individual notion of Adam involves all that will ever happen to him, I mean nothing else but what all philosophers mean when they say that the predicate is in the subject of a true proposition."[109]

Substances are simple (without parts; monads) or compound (collection of simple substances; pluralities). Simple substances are unities, monads, lives, souls, spirits. A living being is a compound substance, comprised of an infinity of simple substances (or monads) united by what is known as a substantial unifier.

4. Monads

The self-individuated entity of Suárez, divested of its dyadic nature, reduced to a simple substance, charged with action, invariably immaterialized, closed in on itself, and harmoniously coordinated with all other such substances is the Leibnizian monad.

---

107 *DM* 34: 3: 3 [26: 360]: Item de intrinseca ratione suppositi ut sic est subsistentia incommunicabilis; sed de ratione individuae naturae creatae non est aliqua subsistentia; ergo individuatio talis naturae non est subsistentia eius; ergo non est individuatio id quod suppositum addit naturae.

108 Leibniz, *Meditationes de Cognitione, Veritate et Ideis*, sect. II, no. VIII. G 4, p. 433: nous pouvons dire que la nature d'une substance individuelle ou d'un être complet, est d'avoir une notion si accomplie qu'elle soit suffisante à comprendre et à en faire déduire tous les prédicats du sujet à qui cette notion est attribuée.

109 Leibniz, *Remarques sur la lettre de M. Arnaud, touchant ma proposition: que la notion individuelle de chaque personne enferme une fois pour toutes ce qui lui arrivera à jamais*. G2, p. 43: car disant que la notion individuelle d'Adam enferme tout ce qui lui arrivera à jamais, je ne veux dire autre chose, si non ce que tous les philosophes entendent en disant praedicatum inesse subiecto verae propositionis.

The evolution of the Suarezian individual to the Leibnizian monad began, in 1663, with the young Leibniz (age 17) in his essay on individuation, professing his belief in individuation shared by Suárez and many others more prominently featured in the essay than the *Eximius* himself. Declared the young self-assured genius, "I therefore assert that every individual is individuated by its total entity.… The individual adds, something rationally distinct, over the common nature."[110] Add to this the idea of active substance and we have the concept of substantial form (reinstated after being rejected by the modern philosophers).

Around 30 years later, in the late 1690s, Leibniz, now secure in his new philosophy, replaced the term "substantial form" with one borrowed from Franciscus Mercurius Helmont (1614-1698)—"monad."

Monads are for Leibniz the ultimate constituents of reality. They are substances, beings capable of action. They have no parts, and hence no shapes, and are therefore indivisible, lacking in extension or differences of quantity or figure. They are simple, but their simplicity does not prevent them from having a plurality of modifications that consist in the variety of relations of correspondence which the substance has with things outside. As Suárez would have said, substance (monad) can exist without mode (e. g. perception), but mode cannot exist without substance.

Monads are formed into composites of hierarchically organized aggregates, with each aggregate culminating in the dominant monad, the soul. The latter is dominant because it perceives all the members of the aggregate more clearly than they do it. Monads are the only substances; substances are qualified by modes; but aggregates of monads [humans, animals and plants] are phenomena only.

Organisms are not substances in the way monads are, but they can be substances in an accidental sense, united by a superadded unifier, an ambiguous entity that is vaguely substantial but not a substance, for then it would be a monad, and monads cannot unify other monads. It is not an accident, for accidents cannot give rise to substantial unities. It is not a mode, for such cannot be preserved in being by itself, as a unifier can. It would seem then to be an intermediate entity between sub-

110 Leibniz, *De principio individui*, sect. 19, p. 24 [1663]: Pono igitur: omne individuum tota sua entitate individuatur… Individuum addere aliquid supra communem naturam ratione distinctum.

stance and accident, a *substantial unifier* that affects substance through pre-established harmony. It is linked to a single dominant monad, and unifies an indefinite number of monads in the same complex.[111]

Monads can neither begin nor end naturally, and therefore they may last as long as the universe, which will change but will not be destroyed. They come into existence only through creation, and perish only by annihilation.

Monads are qualitatively distinguished one from another, by their internal qualities, characterized as perceptions, apperceptions and appetitions, which are also principles of change internal to each monad. *Perception* is every change in a monad; it is defined as "the internal condition of the monad representing external things"[112]; it reflects each monad's view of the universe. We have countless perceptions of which we have no awareness. *Appetition* is the action of "the internal principle which causes the change or the passage from one perception to another."[113] *Apperception* is the consciousness or reflective knowledge of this internal state;[114] it is found only in rational beings.

Monads have different degrees of perception. The lowest degree is one without distinctness, memory or consciousness, such as is true of a plant. A higher degree is one accompanied by memory and feeling, as is found in animals. The highest degree is one endowed with consciousness, found in rational souls or spirits, where the perception is distinct and the perceiver aware of the perception.

Difference in substances is of two kinds, numerical (otherness) and qualitative (unlikeness). Where there is numerical diversity, there is also the qualitative. No two individuals are exactly alike in their qualitative predicates. Essences are not individuated by some non-essential principle, like quantified matter.

No interaction takes place between the monads, because such activity requires that an accident of one substance detach itself from that

111 On the substantial unifier see LeRoy E. Loemker (ed.), *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Philosophical Papers and Letters*, vol. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965, pp 985-995; and John Kronen, "Substances are not Windowless: A Suarezian Critique of Monadism," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 71-1 (1997), pp. 59-79, especially pp. 64-65.

112 Leibniz, *Principes de la Nature et de la Grace, fondés en raison*, n. 4, G 6, pp. 598-600.

113 Leibniz, *Monadologie*, n. 15. G 6,p. 609.

114 Leibniz, *Principes de la Nature et de la Grace, fondés en raison*, n. 4, G 6, pp. 598-600.

substance and attach itself to the substance presumably interacted upon. As accidents can only exist in their proper substances, such a supposition leads to the accidents being (impossibly) transformed into little substances which attach themselves to other substances.

There exist innumerable monads, each of which contains all its successive variations, but they do not form a chaotic agglomeration. They constitute an ordered system in which all monads, each with its particular function, are related to one another, each changing in correspondence with the changes in all the others, in a harmony pre-established by God. For Leibniz the doctrine of pre-established harmony reconciles final and mechanical causality, indeed, subordinates the latter to the former.

5. Optimal universe: proof and disproof

A universe of myriads of indivisible immaterial substances, the monads, each evolving through its own inner law, and all controlled by the chief Monad through the law of pre-established harmony. How could there be a better universe? The present world is surely the best of all possible worlds! The medieval philosophers Aureolus (c. 1280-1322) and Durandus (c. 1270-1334) held similar views.[115]

The Scholastics believed that our universe was the optimal one, but unlike the Leibnizian, its optimum was one of grades of beings—inanimate, vegetal, sensible, intellectual—each having its own characteristic quality, and so imitating in scattered fashion God's unique but multivalent plenitude, the grades thus constituting an integrated ensemble of perfections. Supreme among these types was that of intellectual beings, or immaterial substances, identified as angels. Without them, the Scholastics insisted, there could be no perfect universe. But the Leibnizian optimum was that of beings not typically, but all individually, perfect, the best that each being could possibly be. It will be appropriate first to examine the Scholastic proof of the optimal universe of graduated perfections, the Scholastic disproof of a universe of individual perfection, and the Leibnizian proof of its kind of optimal universe.

The Scholastic proof, based on a passage of Aquinas, is presented by Suárez in the following syllogistic form:

115 Views of Aureolus and Durandus referred to in *DM* 30: 17: 19 [26: 212].

Major: it pertains to the perfection of the universe that there be in it the grade of immaterial substances.

Minor: But God created the universe perfect.

Conclusion: Therefore substances of such a grade exist in it.

Proof of the major: the perfection of the effect depends on the perfect similarity to its cause; so the perfection of the universe depends on its similarity to God to the extent possible. Since therefore God is an immaterial and intellectual substance, the perfection of the universe requires that there be in it immaterial and intellectual substances, by reason of which the universe could be similar to God according to this grade of perfection.

Proof of the minor: from the perfect cause, and one supremely good, which is envious of none, and most powerful, which can be obstructed by none, no effect was bound to proceed, unless perfect. Also because God, in creating the universe intends the communication of His goodness and the manifestation of His perfection. He therefore created the universe composed of various grades and orders, because none sufficed by itself to the end which God intended in the creation of things and for the perfection of the universe. Therefore He needed to compose the universe from this varied order of things, which could supremely confer its perfection and the end described above.[116]

116 *DM* 35: 1: 5 [26: 426]**:** quia ad perfectionem universi pertinuit, ut in eo esset hic gradus substantiarum immaterialium; sed Deus condidit universum perfectum; ergo sunt in eo hujusmodi substantiae. Major probatur primo, quia ad perfectionem effectus pertinet, ut sit perfecte similis causae ; ergo ad perfectionem universi spectat, ut sit similis Deo, quoad fieri possit ; cum ergo Deus sit substantia immaterialis et intellectualis, ad perfectionem universi spectat, ut in eo sint substantiae immateriales et intellectualis, ratione quarum sit simile Deo secundum hunc gradum. Minor vero per se et ex terminis videtur aut vera, aut valde verisimilis, tum quia a perfecta causa, et summe bona, quae nulli invidet, et potentissima, quae a nemine impediri potest, non debuit effectus prodire, nisi perfectus ; tum etiam quia Deus, in condendo universo intendit et communicationem suae bonitatis, et suae perfectionis manifestationem ; ideoque condidit universum ex variis rerum gradibus et ordinibus constans, quia nullus per se sufficiebat ad finem quem in rerum conditione et universi perfectione Deus intendebat ; ergo debuit universum constare ex hoc ordine rerum, qui maxime ad perfectionem eius et ad finem praedictum conferre poterat…

Atque ex hac ultima ratione facile potest probari alterum membrum prioris distinctionis, nimirum, non posse primum ens ita constare ex multis componentibus, ut unum sit quasi primario et ex se, reliqua vero sint ab ipso ; quia

We now turn to the anticipated critique by Suárez[117] on the Leibnizian proof of the optimal universe, attributed by Leibniz himself to an anonymous author, who happens to be Suárez.

Leibniz formulates his position in his *Théodicée* [1710].[118] It has four stages, of which the first two are proposed by Suárez himself. In an uncanny fashion, †he Rationalist seems to be dialoguing with the Scholastic, and to be conceding at the end. Suárez contends that the universe cannot be perfect in its parts (stage 1), and that, imperfect as it is in its parts, it cannot be perfect as a whole (stage 2). Leibniz continues the argument, asserting that the universe, though imperfect, is perfectible (stage 3); and that, at all events, the universe must somehow be perfect, because of the Principle of Sufficient Reason (stage 4).

Stage 1. Leibniz begins by referring to the anti-optimalist argument:

Someone will say that it is impossible to produce the best, because there is no perfect creature, and that it is always possible to produce one which would be more perfect.[119]

These words echo those of Suárez, who reports that some theologians claimed

> that divine power cannot always make more or better species of things, but that God could know of some creatable species so perfect, that God could not create one more perfect than that… Which [reasoning] is solely founded in this, that there cannot be given an infinite regress in specific perfections [so that there can-

---

iam totum illud compositum non est ens a se, neque independens ; nec enim potest unum ab alio dimanare sine aliqua efficientia saltem per naturalem resultantiam…

117 Emanuela Scribano, "False Enemies: Malebranche, Leibniz and the Best of All Possible Worlds." Daniel Garber & Steven Nadler, *Oxford Studies in Early Modern Philosophy*, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003, pp. 165-182. The adversary is not Malebranche but Suárez.

118 Leibniz, *Essais de Théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'Homme, et l'Origine du Mal* [abbreviated to *Théodicée*].

119 Leibniz, *Théodicée*, § 195 : Quelqu'un dira, qu'il est impossible de produire le meilleur, parce qu'il n'y a point de créature parfaite, et qu'il est toujours possible d'en produire une qui le soit davantage.

> not be an endless sequence of species, each more perfect than the previous]….[120]

In response Suárez argues that for a universe to be perfect, the creatures in it have to be singly perfect. However, no creature is perfect, so the optimal world is not possible… The optimalist opinion, says Suárez, derogates God's omnipotence,

> because when there is some substance indicated, however perfect it be, if God cannot make one better, that would not be from the impossibility of the thing, since it is finite, and imperfectly participant in the divine being; therefore if it cannot come to be, it will be solely from the defect of the divine power… It happens that the foundation of those [optimalist] authors is rather weak; no impossibility is involved in it, since there is a regress into infinity in possible species. [So there can be an endless sequence of finite creatures each better than the previous.] It is well-known that in numerical species there can be an infinite regress... Therefore in the entire collection of possible species, which God has most present to Himself, He does not know of any one more perfect than the others; and that is not inappropriate, because there is none such; just as He also is not aware of the maximum part of a continuum of space, because there is none such.[121]

Suárez contends that "There is no impossibility involved in it, that there be an infinite regress in possible species : it is well-known that there can be an infinite regress is the species of numbers, as in the divi-

120 *DM* 30: 17: 19 [26: 212]**:** [Theologi quidam] dixerunt divinam potentiam non posse semper facere plures aut meliores species rerum, sed posse ab ipso Deo cognosci aliquam speciem creabilem adeo perfectam, ut non possit Deus perfectiorem efficere… Quod solum fundatur in hoc, quod non potest dari progressus in infinitum in perfectionibus specificis…

121 *DM* 30 : 17 : 20 [26 : 212]: quia signata aliqua substantia quantumvis perfecta, si Deus non possit facere meliorem, id non posset esse ex repugnantia rei, cum enim illa sit finita, et imperfecte participans esse divinum ; ergo, si illa fieri non potest, solum erit ex defectu divinae potentiae… Accedit quod fundamentum illorum auctorum est valde infirmum ; nulla enim repugnantia in eo involvitur, quod in speciebus possibilibus in infinitum procedatur. Constat enim in numerorum speciebus posse in infinitum procedi, sicut et in divisionibus continui… In tota ergo collectione specierum possibilium, quam Deus habet praesentissimam, nulla cognoscit perfectiorem caeteris omnibus ; neque id est inconveniens, quia nulla est; sicut etiam non cognoscit maximam partem continui, quia nulla est.

sions of space. Furthermore, also in the size of possible bodies—for which Catholic would dare to say that there is a finite body of such magnitude that God cannot make one bigger?"[122] There is no contradiction in the fact that possible species go to infinity. What is valid for the individual creature is valid for the universe. God cannot always act for the best, because nothing outside the divine nature can be described as "the best."

Stage 2. Leibniz re-formulates his position. What is valid for the individual creature is not necessarily valid for the universe. A perfect creature may not be possible, but a perfect universe can be. Infinite aggregates, because they are infinite, can attain a maximal perfection unattainable in finite creatures (taken individually).[123]

Sed contra : the aggregate has to be susceptible to the greatest, which is against the nature of an infinite regress. The greatest number of all, and the largest of all figures, are contradictions.

Stage 3. There is a further re-formulation of Leibniz's argument. The universe is the best possible because it can become better and better, if it is of the nature of things that the best is not attainable all at once. Perfectibility without limit is what proves the optimal character of our universe.

> Besides it might be said that the whole sequence of things to infinity may be the best possible, although what exists all through the universe in each portion of time be not the best. It might be therefore that the universe became even better and better, if the nature

122 *DM* 30 : 17 : 20 [26 : 212]: nulla enim repugnantia in eo involvitur, quod in speciebus possibilibus in infinitum procedatur. Constat enim in numerorum speciebus posse in infinitum procedi, sicut in divisionibus continui. Item in magnitudine corporis possibilis ; quis enim Catholicus audeat dicere, esse posse corpus finitum tantae magnitudinis, ut Deus non possit facere maius?

123 Leibniz, *Théodicée*, §195: Quelqu'un dira, qu'il est impossible de produire le meilleur, parce qu'il n'y a point de créature parfaite, et qu'il est toujours possible d'en produire une qui le soit davantage. Je réponds que ce qui se peut dire d'une créature ou d'une substance particulière, qui peut toujours être surpassée par une autre, ne doit pas être appliqué à l'univers, lequel se devant étendre par toute l'éternité future, est un infini. De plus, il y a une infinité de créatures dans la moindre parcelle de la matière, a cause de la division actuelle du continuum à l'infini. Et l'infini, c'est-à-dire l'amas d'un nombre infini de substances, à proprement parler, n'est pas un tout non plus que le nombre infini lui-même, duquel on ne saurait dire s'il est pair ou impair.

> of things were such that it was not permitted to attain to the best all at once.[124]

Stage 4. Finally, Leibniz seeks to establish his thesis through the Principle of Sufficient Reason. God, contends our optimalist, "is incapable of acting without reason, and that would be even acting against reason."[125]

6. Streamlined metaphysics. Wolff

Leibniz did not organize his thought in one comprehensive system; anyone who came near to achieving that task was Christian Wolff (1679-1754), who to Kant was "the greatest of the dogmatic philosophers." Wolff was the most influential thinker in Germany from around 1720 to 1770:[126] none of the German philosophical developments can be appreciated without a knowledge of Wolff's *Ontology* [1728]. He was indeed greatly impressed by Leibniz, but also by thinkers so different from the latter as Spinoza and Hume. In fact, Wolff was uncomfortable with much of what was original in Leibniz, such as monads, the inclusion of predicates in their subjects and the theory of the optimal universe. For Wolff, experience is the foundation of all philosophy, hardly a tenet to delight the ears of a Rationalist.

Wolff admired the work of Suárez, and sought to structure his ontology on the Scholastic model. He is misakenly reputed be the author of a science of abstract being, separated from all actual being, "intégralement désextentialisée,"[127] but still be considered as a science of being.

Wolff's pupil Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714-1762) was the author of a book, *Metaphysica*, on which Kant, in his pre-

124 Leibniz, *Théodicée*, § 202: Outre qu'on pourrait dire que toute la suite des choses à l'infini peut être la meilleure qui soit possible, quoique ce qui existe par tout l'univers dans chaque parti du temps ne soit le meilleur. Il se pourrait donc que l'univers allât toujours de mieux en mieux, si telle était la nature des choses, qu'il ne fût point permis d'atteindre au meilleur d'un seul coup.

125 Leibniz, *Théodicée*, §196: car il est incapable d'agir sans raison, et ce serait même agir contre la raison.

126 Jean-Paul Paccioni, "L'aptitude à exister et la métaphysique wolfienne," *Archives de Philosophie* 65, 2002, pp. 65-80.

127 Étienne Gilson, *Être et essence*, pp. 169-170.

critical period, based his teaching. Later Kant was to remark on "the celebrated Wolff and his acute follower Baumgarten."[128] Was he being sarcastic, considering with what alacrity he worked to destroy the metaphysics elaborated by Baumgarten and Wolff?

Wolff sought to streamline metaphysics, which he did by disposing its material as a chain of definitions—of "being, nothing, something, possible, impossible.""Being" is said to be that which can exist, and consequently, that to which existence is not repugnant."[129] [We may recall here that, for Duns Scotus (c 1265-1308) himself, being (*ens*) is that to which existence is not repugnant, *cui non repugnat esse*.[130]] This "non-repugnance" is what differentiates being from the simple "possible." Non-repugnance defines being even before it does essence and the "essentialia" which constitute it. Some definitions: "Nothing: that to which no notion responds. Something: that to which some notion responds."[131] "The impossible is said to be whatever involves contradiction."[132] "The possible is that which involves no contradiction, what is not impossible."[133]

Wolff clearly rejects the allegation that in his philosophy "being" is equivalent to "possibility." He writes:

> The notion of being certainly adds over and above to the notion of possible, the capacity or possibility to exist, and indeed necessarily adds over and above, because of which it flows from the notion of possible, and therefore, the possibility of the thing being given, its possibility to exist is also posited. Therefore possible and being

128 Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics* § 3.

129 Wolff, *Prima philosophia, sive Ontologia, methodo scientifica pertractata*. Franfurt & Leipzig 1736. Joannes Ecole (ed.), *Christiani Wolfii Philosophia Prima sive Ontologia*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, *1962*, § 134, p. 115: Ens dicitur, quod existere potest, consequenter cui existentia non repugnat.

130 Duns Scotus. *Ordinatio* I, d. 2, pars 2, qq. 1-4, n. 262. C. Balic (ed.), Vatican 1950, tome 2, p. 282.

131 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 57, p. 40: Nihilum dicimus, cui nulla respondet notio; § 59, p. 41: Aliquid est, cui notio aliqua respondet.

132 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 79, p. 62: Impossibile dicitur, quicquid contradictionem involvit.

133 Wolff, *Ontologia*, §. 85, p. 65: Possibile est, quod nullam contradictionem involvit, quod non est impossibile.

> are not in fact synonyms. The sufficient reason for existence is not included in possibility.[134]

Wolff makes his position quite clear when he says: "Here I define existence through the complement of possibility... Existence is also called actuality."[135]

The German spokesman of the Enlightenment is concerned to preserve the unity of the concept of being. This concept, as he presents it, consists of three strands.

1. *Simple possibility: of something that is conceptualizable and non-contradictory;* "What can exist.[136]

2. *Positive aptitude for existence an intrinsic attribute: consequenter cui existentia non repugnat.* "Consequently to which existence is not repugnant."

3. *Actually exercised existence*: "Hence it follows that existence is not determined by possibility, since possibility so far is not the determining factor nor existence the determined factor, it is clear further, that possibility is not the sufficient reason for existence, and what is more from the fact that something is previously recognized as possible, one does not understand why it exists.[137]

Wolff's concept of being combines 1 & 2 and excludes 3.

How does this compare with being as conceived by Suárez? As we have had frequent occasion to remark, Suarezian being is unitarily dyadic, simultaneously participial and nominal. It denotes, all at once, both actual being (as actually exercised, *ens ut participium*) and

---

134 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 135, p. 116: Notio nimirum entis notioni possibilis superaddit potentiam seu possibilitatem existendi et quidem necessario superaddit, propterea quod ex possibilis notione fluat, atque adeo posita possibilitate rei, ponitur etiam eius existendi possibilitas. Possibilis adeo et ens non prorsus synonyma sunt. Ratio existentiae sufficiens in possibilitate non contenta. ...

135 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 174: Hinc existentiam definio per complementum possibilitatis... Dicitur existentia etiam actualitas. ... 85

136 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 134, p. 115: Ens dicitur, quod existere potest, consequenter cui existentia non repugnat.

137 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 172, p. 141: Hinc consequitur possibilitate existentiam non determinari; cumque adeo possibilitas non sit determinans, nec existentia determinatum, patet porro, possibilitatem non esse rationem sufficientem existentiae, atque adeo ex eo, quod aliquid possible a priori agnoscatur, nondum intelligi, cur existat.

aptitudinal being (as prescinding from, but not excluding, actual exercise, *ens ut nomen*). While being has this dyadic significance, the accent is on participial not nominal being. Wolffian being, on the other hand, is monadic; it eliminates actually exercised being and retains the precisively abstracted; it also stays clear of possible being, which is existence that not only prescinds from, but negates actual exercise.

Of the three strands in Wolffian being, the first corresponds to the Leibnizian notion of being, as *essentia seu realitas in genere sive possibilitas... nihil aliud est realitas quam cogitabilitas* "essence or reality generically, or possibility… Reality is nothing other than conceivability"; in other words, what does not imply contradiction and hence is possible. Wolff would therefore seem to be reverting partially to the Suarezian notion of being, which anon was to fall into disfavor.

V. COMPLETED ANAMORPHISM OF SUÁREZ'S METAPHYSICS

1. Supertranscendentalists

Suárez, protagonist of philosophical realism, conceived of metaphysics as the science of the transcendentals—*unum, verum, bonum*—and was zealous to preserve its realism from alien contamination. Metaphysics, he maintained, is concerned with reality, not fiction;[138] "real being insofar as it is real being is the adequate object of this science."[139] Indeed, "real being and fictional being do not in any way have a formal content, since fictional being is nothing, and has only the word 'being' in common with real being."[140]

But already in his time this contamination was spreading, noticeably in the tendency of some thinkers of going beyond the transcendentals, and not describable in the latter's terms, to include thought categories that were entirely intra-mental (like negations, privations and relations of reason): a tendency, in other words, to reduce metaphysical

138 Juan Roig Gironella, "Investigación sobre los problemas que plantea la filosofía moderna el ente de razón," *Pensamiento* 11 (1955), pp. 285-302.

139 *DM* 1: 1: 26 [25: 11]: ens in quantum ens reale esse obiectum adaequatum huius scientiae.

140 *De anima*, 4: 1: 4 [3: 714]: reale ens et rationis non habent rationem formalem unam ullo modo, cum ens rationis nihil sit, solaque entis voce conveniat cum reali ente:"

concerns to those of logic and epistemology. Descartes's greater interest in *ens inquantum cognitum* than in Suárez's *ens inquantum ens reale*, was symptomatic of these concerns, as was Leibniz's doctrine of *cogitabilitas*. [See Chapter 3.] Intimations of this tendency can be noted in Scholasticism even anterior to Suárez, of the groping for a concept more abstract than the transcendental one, "of common relations, as abstracting from the transcendental and the predicamental, that could not be a generic concept, but (if I may so put it) a supertranscendental one."[141] As it turned out, a new supertranscendental discipline emerged, the possibility of which does not seem to have occurred to the *Doctor Eximius*, a discipline of symbols and signs—semiotics—brilliantly formulated by Suárez's younger contemporary, the Dominican John of St. Thomas (1589-1644), the *Doctor Profundus*.[142]

John was following in the footsteps of the Dominican Cajetan (1469-1534), who in 1507 observed that systematized knowledge (*scientia*) had a double object, as thing (=extra-mental entity) and as object (=conceptual construct, having reality only in the mind).[143] In 1554 the Dominican Domingo de Soto (1495-1560) clearly stated that there were terms "which are called super-transcendent, because they extend to many more things than the transcendent, like the imaginable."[144] Some decades later John of St. Thomas, who was only nine years older than Descartes, contended that "it can well be that any being incapable of existence is capable of truth, not as a subject but as an object, insofar as it does not in itself have existence, which as a subject can lay the foundation of truth and cognoscibility, but has that which as object can be known in the manner of real being and so ex-

141 *DM* 48: 1: 5 [26: 869]: conceptus abstractior, scilicet, respectus in communi, ut abstrahit a transcendentali et praedicamentali, non potest esse genericus, sed (ut ita dicam), supertranscendentalis.

142 John of St. Thomas, *Tractatus de Signis. The Semiotic of John Poinsot*. Interpretive Arrangement by John N. Deely. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985. Cf. pp. 44-45, n. 2.

143 Cajetan, *Commentaria in Summam Theologiae*, IP., q. 1, art. 3: nota duplicem esse rationem formalem obiecti in scientia: alteram obiecti ut res, alteram obiecti ut obiectum.

144 Domingo de Soto, *Summulae summularum*, ed. Salamanca 1554, cap. 6. n. 4: qui dicuntur super-transcendentes qui ad plura se extendunt quam transcendentes, ut imaginabile.

ist objectively in the intellect as something true."[145] What John called *cognoscibilitas* Leibniz was to term *cogitabilitas*.

= For Suárez, only what is real, as "being," is known by its own species, hence is "intrinsically" intelligible. But fictional beings are "non-being" and so are not intelligible through their own species but only through that of "being," which is extrinsic to them; they are therefore "extrinsically" intelligible.[146] This kind of intelligibility engrossed the attention of a Calvinist Scholastic of the 17th century, the allegedly Suarezian Clemens Timpler (1567-1624), author of *Metaphysicae systema methodicum* (Steinfurt, 1604). Timpler's main concern was to continue the task of systematizing metaphysics that Suárez had begun. For Timpler Aristotle's *Metaphysics* was "confused, prolix, incomplete"; he insisted on the urgent need for a *systema compendiarum, planum, methodicum, plenius*, a system that would *exprimere totam rei in Metaphysica consideratae universitatem*, "represent the complete totality of the matter considered in metaphysics."[147]

= Metaphysics, Timpler said did not, as Suárez claimed, contemplate only being, but also non-being, as well as the essence and privation of being" (*non tantum ens, sed etiam non ens, adeoque essentiam et privationem entis*). Metaphysics had therefore to include "*pan noeton*, hoc est omne intelligibile.»[148] Timpler may have thought that he was continuing the systematization of metaphysics that Suárez's had begun, but the Doctor had made himself quite clear on the subject. If he was

145 John of St. Thomas, *Ars logica, pars prima*. John N. Deely (trans.) *Tractatus de signis. The Semiotics of John Poinsot*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, p. 150: Unde bene stat, quod aliquod ens incapax existentiae sit capax veritatis, non ut subiectum, sed ut obiectum, quatenus non habet in se entitatem, quae tamquam subiectum fundet veritatem et cognoscibilitatem, sed habet, quod tamquam obiectum possit cognosci ad instar entis realis et sic obiective esse in intellectu tanquam verum.

146 John P. Doyle, "'Extrinsic Cognoscibility'. A Seventeenth Century Supertranscendental Notion," *The Modern Schoolman* 68 (1990), pp. 57-80. See also Juan Roig Gironella, "Investigación sobre los problemas que plantea la filosofia moderna el ente de razón," *Pensamiento*, vol. 11 (1955), pp. 285-302. Other works pertinent to topic in Bibliography.

147 Clemens Timpler, *Metaphysicae systema methodicum*, Steinfurt, 1604. Problema 5.

148 Clemens Timpler, *Metaphysicae systema methodicum*. Hanover 1616, lib. 1, c. 1, probl. 5 (p. 6): concludo. Subiectum proprium et adaequatum metaphysicae esse omne intelligibile.

certain about anything, it was that the object of metaphysics was real, and only real, being.[149] There was, to repeat, no concept common to real and fictional being, the commonality at most was verbal and not real.[150] Fictional beings, not being true beings, but rather shadows of beings, are not intelligible in themselves, and therefore not knowable by themselves.[151] The intelligibility that Timpler cared about would have been judged by Suárez to be of dubious value.

But Timpler was determined to undertake the foray into this region of dubious extrinsic intelligibility with or without the blessings, not only of Suárez, but also of his Calvinist co-religionists (who were aware of his thought), like Rudolf Goclenius (1547-1628), Bartholomeus Keckermann (1571-1609) and Johann Baptist Clauberg (1622-1665), as well as Lutherans like Daniel Stahl (1585-1654) and Christoph Scheibler (1589-1653), the "German Suárez." But it was taken up by the rationalists like Leibniz, and by Suárez's own Jesuit co-religionists of the 17th and 18th centuries, including the following eight: Thomas Compton Carleton (1591-1666). Sebastián Izquierdo (1601-1681), Antonio Bernaldo de Quirós (1613-1668), André Semery (1630-1717) Ignacio Peynado (1633-1696), Juan de Ulloa (1639-1723), Luis de Lossada (1681-1748), and Maximilian Wietrowski (1660-1737).

The following is a sample of how the Jesuit supertranscendentalists describe the common univocal concept of their speculation, and the categories subsumed under it. For Ignacio Peynado extrinsic knowability is the common concept, for "real and notional beings concur univocally under this concept of apt-to-be-extrinsically-known, or *extrinsically knowable*."[152]

149 *DM* 47: 3: 3 [26: 794]: diximus obiectum adaequatum et directum metaphysicae non esse ens commune ad reale et rationis, sed ad reale tantum.

150 *DM* 4: 7: 4 [25: 138]: ens rationis... non habet communem conceptum, nec realem convenientiam cum ente reali, et ideo divisio entis in ens reale et rationis non recte inter divisiones entis numeratur, quia illa magis est divisio nominis quam rei.

151 *DM* 54: 1: 1 [26: 1015]: cum entia rationis non sint vera entia, sed quasi umbrae entium, non sunt per se intelligibilia, sed per aliquam analogiam et conjunctionem ad vera entia, et ideo nec etiam sunt per se scibilia.

152 Ignacio Peynado, *Logica*, tract. 5, d. 2, sec. 3, n. 47 (p. 410): ens reale et rationis univoce conveniunt sub hoc concept aptum extrinsece cognosci, seu

The Suarezian Luis de Lossada elaborates the notion of extrinsic knowability, distinguishing real from notional being, noting that "notional being does not have the passive and *intrinsic knowability*, which alone is transcendental truth, as well as the attribute of real being; but it does have *extrinsic knowability*, by which it is rendered extrinsically knowable, and which is nothing else than the ability of the intellect to have notional being placed before it, or the possibility of cognition terminating in it." And in another place Lossada contends that "real being and fictitious being can be univocally classified under some extrinsic predicate, for example, under the concept of 'known' or 'extrinsically knowable.'"[153]

Juan de Ulloa succintly characterizes this univocal category as "the supreme genus of all is this: the *knowable*."[154]

Subsumed under this univocal category, Antonio Bernaldo de Quirós observes, are the knowable and the imaginable: "being that is known, knowable and intelligible, abstracts from real and notional being: hence the *knowable* and the *imaginable* are called supertranscendental terms, because they apply to being and non being."[155]

---

cognoscibile extrinsece... Quotations from the Jesuit supertranscendentalists taken from Doyle's article "'Extrinsic Cognoscibility'. A Seventeenth Century Supertranscendental Notion," *The Modern Schoolman* 68 (1990), pp. 57-80. Quotations from Semery are taken from Doyle, "Between transcendental and transcendental: the missing link?" *The Review of Metaphysics* 50 (June 1997), pp. 783-815. The quotations are from Semery's *Logica*, a part of his *Triennium philosophicum* published in Rome in 1674.

153 Luis de Lossada, *Metaphysica*, disp. 4, c. 44, n. 47 (tom. 10, p. 277): ens rationis non habet cognoscibilitatem passivam et intrinsecam, quae sola est transcendentalis veritas, et passio entis realis; habet tamen cognoscibilitatem extrinsecam, a qua redditur extrinsece cognoscibile, et quae nihil est aliud, quam potentia intellectus ut sibi objiciat ens rationis, vel possibilitas cognitionis ad ipsam terminatae; disp. 1, c. 4, n. 64 (tom. 10, p. 51): Poterunt tamen univocari ens reale et fictum in aliquo praedicamento extrinseco, v.g. in ratione cogniti vel extrinsece cognoscibilis ut sic.

154 Juan de Ulloa, *Logica maior*, Rome 1712, disp. 3, cap. 1, n. 3 (p. 242): genus omnium supremum est hoc: cognoscibile.

155 Antonio Bernaldo de Quiros, *Opus philosophicum*. Lugdunum/Lyons 1666. *Logica*, tract. 2, disp. 10, sect. 8, p. 65: esse cognitum seu cognoscibile et intelligibile abstrahit ab ente reali et rationis: ideo dicuntur termini supertranscendentes cognoscibile seu imaginabile, quia enti et non enti competunt.

For Thomas Compton Carleton the subsumed categories are the intelligible and the imaginable, for "supertranscendental terms are not just those of true things, but are also affirmed of fictitious ones, as *intelligible*, *imaginable*; whence it is said that imaginable being extends wider than possible being."[156]

For Sebastián Izquierdo the subsumed categories are the possible and the impossible: "all human sciences can, by our intellect... be entirely reduced to two... the physical and the metaphysical. The object of the latter comprehends all being, both the *impossible* and the *possible* with precision of existence."[157] [Suárez could have accepted a new science, say semiotics, but would have opposed any change of object in metaphysics.] John of St. Thomas had no problem with both sciences.

For André Semery, (1630-1717) "The adequate object of the intellect is wider than the object of metaphysics… That of the intellect is being in its widest sense [which is "supertranscendent," it] comprehends the possible and the impossible. The adequate object of metaphysics,[which is "transcendent"] is real being." However, for Semery, metaphysics is redundant, as its matter is covered by logic and physics.[158]

Finally, also for the philosopher who marks the climax of the supertranscendentalist trend, Maximilian Wietrowski, the subsumed categories are possible and impossible: "Being is nothing but the possibility of really existing... just as there is the quidditative concept of real being and of impossible being, thus also there is given a concept

156 Thomas Compton Carleton, *Philosophia universa*, Antwerp 1649, *Logica*, disp. 2, sec.6, n. 5 (p. 8): Termini supertranscendentales sunt qui non de rebus veris tantum, sed etiam de fictis affirmantur, ut intelligibile, imaginabile; unde ut dici solet, latius patet ens imaginabile quam ens possibile.

157 Sebastian Izquierdo, *Pharus scientiarum*, Lugdunum/Lyons 1659, Praefatio ad lectorem: Universas scientias humanas ab intellectu nostro... ad duas omnino revocari... ad physicam scilicet et metaphysicam... Obiectum autem posterioris omne ens tam impossibile quam possibile comprehendit cum praecisione ab existentia.

158 André Semery, *Logica*, in *Triennium philosophicum*, Rome 1674. … latius patere obiectum intellectus humani quam obiectum metaphysicae [disput. ultima; 1, pp. 787-788.]. Obiectum adaequatum esse ens, secundum illam latitudinem acceptum, secundum quam non solum possibilia, sed etiam impossibilia comprehendit [disp. 4; 1, p. 541] Ens reale est obiectum adaequatum metaphysicae [disput. ultima; 1, p. 787]

of being that abstracts from the *possible* or real and the *impossible*, and this concept is called supertranscendental being."[159] Wietrowski articulated a distinction, between *esse entis* (the being of being) and *esse signi* (the being of sign) that could be taken to resolve the antinomy between the old realist metaphysics and the new representationalist semiotics: metaphysics was the science of the *esse entis* (being of being) and semiotics the science of the *esse signi* (being of sign).[160]

2. Kant

Supertranscendentalism was just another moment in the triumph of the subjective in modern philosophy. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) himself promoted the unqualified preeminence of subjectivity (the intra-mental) over objectivity (extra-mental reality) which had been made the hallmark of modern philosophy by Descartes. Subjectivity now becomes the basis of the objectivation (through the pure concepts, or categories) of the sensible data given to the human consciousness in time and space. It is now the establisher, not of objective reality as such (the notorious thing-in-itself), but only of the objectively apparent, not of things as they are, but only as they appear.

Kant shows no great familiarity with the Scholastics, but he was aware of their *a priori* concepts of objects, "propounded in the proposition… *quodlibet ens est unum, verum, bonum*."[161] This was the Scholastic problem of the number of the transcendentals, the basic properties of being. For Aquinas they were five: *res, unum, aliquid, verum, bonum*. Suárez's list, reduced to three—*unum, verum, bonum*.—and fixed as the standard, was taken over by Christian Wolff (1679-1754)

159 Maximilian Wietrowski, *Philosophia disputata, in qua comprehenduntur conclusiones ex universa philosophia Aristotelis*. Prague, 1697. Pars I, Logica, concl. 13, cap. 1, n. 1: Ens nihil aliud dicit formaliter quam posse existere realiter... sicut datur conceptus quidditativus entis realis et entis impossibilis, ita etiam datur conceptus entis abstrahentis a possibili seu reali et impossibili, qui conceptus vocatur ens supertranscendentale...

160 Maximilian Wietrowski, *Philosophia disputata, in qua comprehenduntur conclusiones ex universa philosophia Aristotelis*. Prague, 1697. Pars I, Logica, d. 13, sec. 7, n. 3: [veritas] est conformitas in esse signi seu representationis... concedo... est conformitas cum obiecto in esse entis, nego...

161 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* B 113. See *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith [NKS], London : Macmillan and Co., 1929. NKS has B 113 on p. 118.

in his *Ontologia* and then by his disciple Alexander Baumgarten (1714-1762), whose *Metaphysica* was at the base of Kant's pre-critical lectures on metaphysics.[162] Here then was a continuum from the Doctor of Coimbra to the Professor of Königsberg.

Be that as it may, with Kant the process that began with Descartes comes full circle. For the Scholastics man was an imperfect being entirely human in his imperfect mode of knowing. Descartes had set man on the path to divinization; Leibniz, Malebranche, Spinoza followed that track. Kant re-humanized man, so to speak, but his human knowledge was significantly constricted.

For the Scholastics (and Suárez) the universe of the intellect was a three-tiered hierarchy, with the divine intellect at the summit, the angelic in the middle, and the human at the bottom. The divine intellect's knowledge was realized through its essence; that of the angelic through innate ideas implanted there by the divine intellect, the guarantor of their veracity; and that of the human through sense-experience and abstraction. Descartes elevated the human mind into the angelic, and while he did not divinize it, we have seen (in Section III, no. 6, p. 256) how he initiated the process of its divinization, where thought attains itself not by a reflex knowledge but immediately as a primary object, as it does in God. (Malebranche and Spinoza, in their own ways, completed the divinization.) But Kant was to cut at the root of Descartes's inchoate divinization by declaring that no human mind can be conscious of itself except mediately. As the author of the three *Critiques* puts it, "the determination of my existence in time is possible only through the existence of actual things which I perceive outside me… In other words, the consciousness of my existence is at the same time an immediate consciousness of the existence of other things outside me."[163]

While the rationalists were divinizing the human mind, the empiricists (particularly the Humean sort) were animalizing it, so to speak, claiming that the self of man was a series or bundle of perceptions; the same could be said of a horse. Then Kant appeared and, in a manner of speaking, resolved the conflict between the innate ideas of the Rationalists and the sense experience of the empiricists.

---

162 Cornelio Fabro, "Il transcendentale moderno e il transcendentale tomistico," *Angelicum* 60 (1983), pp. 534-558.

163 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* B 276. NKS p. 245.

In so doing, he re-instated features of the human mind that had been attributed to it by the Scholastics, but in ways that the latter would hardly have approved.[164] [See Chapter 5, Section III, "Theories of Knowledge".] The ascension into the realm of the transcendental that the Scholastics had permitted man's mind to undertake was curtailed, its abstractive wings were clipped, it was dragged down to earth and immured forever in the prison of the sensible.

In other words, the intellectual process initiated by the Scholastics, from sense experience to intellectual transcendence, was reversed by Kant—from intellectual transcendence back to phenomenal experience. For the Scholastics, knowledge begins with the senses, and sensible knowledge, through abstraction and intellectual intuition, rises to produce concepts that portray transcendent reality. With Kant, the intellect degrades its innate ideas into *a priori* categories, whose only task is to serve the senses by ordering their manifold impressions and enclosing them as marrow contained in bone. It was an empiricist victory but on rationalist terms.

The Scholastic view was that all entity is intelligible, encompassing beings like God, the intelligences, and matter. Kant evidently accepted their intelligibility—in particular that of God, freedom and immortality, all belonging to the realm of the "unconditioned"—but their intelligibility was inaccessible to the speculative or theoretical reason. To quote his words, "For we are brought to the conclusion that we can never transcend the limits of possible experience, though that is precisely what this science [metaphysics] is concerned, above all else, to achieve."[165]

However, there is still the practical reason, for "when all progress in the field of the supersensible has thus been denied to speculative reason, it is still open to us to enquire whether, in the practical knowledge of reason, data may not be found sufficient to determine reason's transcendent concept of the unconditioned."[166] Practical reason could achieve what the speculative could not; in this sense the practical was superior to the speculative. From the Scholastic viewpoint, however,

164 Juan Roig Gironella, "Metafísica de la forma," *Pensamiento* 14 (1958), pp. 263-286. Contrast between the Suarezian and Kantian doctrines on truth and objective reality.

165 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B xix-xx. NKS p. 24.

166 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Preface to the Second edition, B xxi. NKS pp. 24-25.

the opposite is true. The practical intellect presupposes the speculative as directing and guiding it; an impotent speculative reason cannot guide and direct anything. It is assumed that the speculative intellect knows without error, so that the practical may originate from it.[167]

Yet difficulties are not lacking to the Kantian position; there is always that enigmatic thing-in-itself, which is said to underlie the sensations and appearances experienced by us. Kant peremptorily states that "nothing whatever can be asserted to the thing-in-itself, which may underlie these appearances."[168] We suspect that it exists through the use of the categories of causality and existence in a system that does not permit their application outside the realm of the phenomena. We cannot dispense with it, for "otherwise we should be landed in the absurd conclusion that there can be appearance without anything that appears."[169] [Still there is the little problem that if it is unknowable, we can hardly know that it exists. The thing-in-itself, the one tenebrous dogmatic element encrusted in the lucent body of a critical philosophy, proved to be the system's eventual obfuscation and the resurgence of metaphysics.]

So much for what the Scholastics call the human mind's "adequate" object. Regarding its "proportionate" object, Kant would not have objected to the way Suárez phrased the Scholastic viewpoint, that " the object proportionate to the human intellect according to its natural state is the sensible or material thing."[170] Looked at more carefully, this proportionate object was twofold, material accidents, and material substances. What the Scholastics describe as "accidents" could be taken as equivalents of the Kantian "sensations," objects given in empirical or sense intuition; they are the phenomena. A phenomenon is

---

167 John of St. Thomas, *Cursus Theologicus, In Primam Partem Divi Thomae commentarii,* Solesmes Benedictines [eds.]. Paris: Desclée, vol. 1, 1931. Disp. 2, art. 10, nn. 3 & 5 : Si ergo practicum supponit speculativum tanquam dirigens et praecedens se, ergo debet supponere speculativum perfecte et sine errore cognoscens, ut ex illo oriatur practicum; alioquin si speculatio errat, practicum non poterit rectificari, et sic emendare et dirigere ipsam speculationem.

168 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A49/B66. NKS p. 87.

169 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B xxvi-xxvii. NKS P. 27.

170 *De anima*, 4: 1: 5 [3: 714]: obiectum proportionatum intellectui humano secundum statum naturalem suum est res sensibilis seu materialis.

"knowable by its proper likeness clearly representing it"[171], by reason of which it can be maintained that "only accidents sensible by themselves are proportionate to our intellect."[172]

As for material substances, they would belong to the category of the thing- in-itself, and so be unattainable by the human mind. "In another way the object is said to be proportionate, because it can be essentially known by the intellect at least through its effects, if they are adequate, and in this way too material substance is proportionate to the human intellect."[173]

However, as the history of later German thought shows, Kant was not successfully in demarcating the limits of knowledge. His diktat was challenged, among others, by Hegel, who wished to know what were the experiential grounds on which Kant justified that demarcation. How can we be sure that there are not limits to how much we can know about the "limits of knowledge"[174] demanded the ideologue of the Absolute. For that matter, if we could know these limits of knowledge, we would also know what is beyond them, since "wherever there is a limit, there is an unlimited, just on the other side."[175]

So it was the conviction of Hegel that his "unlimited," Kant's "unconditioned," would not be repressed after all, that no reasoning was cogent enough to remove metaphysics from the realm of human knowledge.

3. Hegel

Human cognition returned to philosophy with Kant and Being with Georg Hegel (1770-1831), the creator of the last comprehensive system of metaphysics in the West. Subjectivity (the intra-mental) is

171 *De anima*, 4: 1: 6 [3: 714]: cognoscibile per propriam speciem ipsum clare repraesentantem.

172 *De anima*, 4: 1: 6 [3: 714]: sola accidentia per se sensibilia proportionari intellectui nostro.

173 *De anima*, 4: 1: 6 [3: 714]: Altero modo proportionari dicitur, quia potest quidditative cognosci ab intellectu per effectus saltem, si adaequati fuerint, hocque modo substantiam materialem esse quoque proportionatam humano intellectui.

174 Hegel, *Heidelberg Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*, part A, section 36.

175 Hegel, *Heidelberg Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*, part A, section 34.

totally identified with objectivity (extra-mental reality). This identity is Being, or the Absolute, a substance encompassing all its modes. It is the whole of reality, evolving through a process of self-reflection. Kant's finite subjectivity is replaced by the Hegelian absolute subjectivity, removing the obstacle to the knowledge of the thing-in-itself and to the intimate essence of things.

For scholars who view the history of Western philosophy instructed by their guru Heidegger, Greek philosophy was in a aggravated state of decline in the West, when Suárez appeared and infused it with some vigor, enabling it to inspire, in a hidden fashion, the transcendental philosophy of the moderns and even to determine the bases and the goals of Hegel's epoch-making *Logic* (*Wissenschaft der Logik*, 1812-1816). Thus Suárez was a factor of continuity between the Greeks, the medievals and the moderns, significantly situated in a line that goes from Parmenides to Nietzsche himself. Hegelian metaphysics has been titled inverted Spinozism and monistic Leibnizianism and so is seen as a variant of modern philosophies that evolved under the impact of Suarezian ideas.We have had occasion to discourse on Suárez's idea of being in the previous chapters. A brief description of Hegel's Being is in order.[176]

Hegel's name for Being is the Absolute. It is self-thinking Thought or Spirit; it is Totality, reality as a whole, the universe, describable in Spinozan terms as a unit of substance and modes (in contrast to Schelling's absolute, which was substance without modes). The totality is a process, the active principle which does not transcend reality but exists through and in it.

The Absolute is dependent on nothing, and is indeterminate and immediate, and hence the absolute beginning. The idea of *being* is fundamental to the German idealist's system, but it evokes its antithesis, *non-being*. Being and non-being are radically opposed to each other; there is a contradiction between their similarity or identity, on the one hand, and their radical opposition, on the other. For it is a principle of Hegel's philosophy that categories turn into their opposites. Yet they are not mutually exclusive, for they necessarily produce a synthesis, *becoming*, the only known category that stands in this relation to a given pair of mutually contrary categories.

176 Some material on Hegel taken from Howard P. Kainz, *G.W.F. Hegel. The Philosophical System*. Athens, Ohio : Ohio University Press, 1996.

Both the realist Suárez and the idealist Hegel affirmed the primacy of being in philosophy, Suárez, by declaring its autonomy in relation to theology, and Hegel when he rescued it from Kant's epistemological morass. Widely different though the two philosophers' ideas of being are, there are some significant parallels: such as exiguousness in content, indeterminacy and immediacy. Suárez's being has an *exiguousness of content*.[177] As we noted in Chapter 3, the concept of being has many levels of abstraction, conditioned by the broadness or narrowness of their conceptual focusing. Most broadly focused, at its most abstract, being signifies no more than a not-nothing. Some scholars take Suárez's not-nothing to be a sign of his "nihilism," as though the Uncommon Doctor had actually said that being is nothing.[178]

Hegel, however, did say just that, so his concept of being has, so to speak, no content at all. In its isolated abstraction, Being is pure Nothing (*das reine Nichts*), since it is Being of which nothing determinate

177 *DM* 28 : 3 : 16 [26 : 19] : creatura, concepta sub abstractissima et confusissima ratione entis ut sic… solum confuse concipiatur sub ratione existentis extra nihil. *DM* 31 : 4 : 6 [26 : 236] : nam existentia nihil aliud est quam illud esse, quo formaliter et *immediate* entitas aliqua constituitur extra causas suas et desinit esse nihil, et incipit esse aliquid. *DM* 2: 2: 16 [26: 75]: Est ergo advertendum, abstractionem seu praecisionem intellectus non requirere distinctionem rerum, seu praecisionem alicuius rationis vel modi, quae ex natura rei antecedat in re ipsa praecisionem intellectus, sed in re simplicissima posse fieri huiusmodi praecisionem variis modis... Sic igitur abstrahit et praescindit intellectus aliquid ab aliquo tanquam commune a particulari, non ob distinctionem vel praecisionem quae in re antecedat, sed ob imperfectum, confusum, seu inaedequatum modum concipiendi suum...

178 John P. Doyle, "Heidegger and Scholastic Metaphysics," *The Modern Schoolman*, 49 (March. 1972), pp. 201-220, especially p. 209: "As regards Heidegger's criticism, therefore, we believe that he has rightly discerned the limits and direction of Suarezian metaphysics and there is basis for his charge of 'nihilism' against it.» Some reasons given in support of Suárez's "nihilism" are the following three : 1. Suárez abandons contact with things as they exist (*ens ut participium*) and proceeds to explicate reality through the objective concept of being as a noun (*ens ut nomen*). 2. Being becomes a univocal, and the lowest common denominator, embracing all real beings from God to mere possibles, including the latter only insofar as they are *extra nihil*, or insofar as they have a double-negative reality of *not not-being*. 3. Suárez treats the touchstone of real being, pre-requisite for inclusion under the common objective concept of being as a noun which is the object of metaphysics is simply *non-contradiction*.

can or should be said. Being and nothingness are two aspects of the same unnameable genus. Pure being and pure nothing are the same: the mind passes from being to non-being and from non-being back to being; it can rest in neither, and each disappears, as it were, into its opposite. If we try to think of being without any determination at all, we find we are thinking nothing. But the tension between being and non-being is resolved by becoming. Becoming is therefore the first concrete thought and therefore the first notion of which Being and Nothing are mere abstractions.

Being for Suárez is also *indeterminate*,[179] or, as he puts its, most simple that is to say, it does not represent the particular kinds of being, such as substance and quantity. It is determined to these modes of being by a sharper conceptual focusing determination or expression (*per maiorem expressionem*. See Chapter 3).

For Hegel too, pure being (*reines Sein*) is "immediate and indeterminate," or is the "indeterminate immediate," empty or vacuous, and for this reason passes into its opposite, non-being.[180] Being is *indeterminate*, and therefore it is the absolute beginning, which it would not be if it were in any way determined; and if it were in fact determined, it

179 *DM* 2 : 2 : 8 [25 : 72]: conceptum entis esse simplicissimum, et primum omnium, determinarique ad substantiam, quantitatem, etc. per quandam *determinationem* et expressionem talis modi entis. *DM* 2: 2: 15 [25: 75]:Dico secundo: hic conceptus obiectivus est secundum rationem praecisus ab omnibus particularibus, seu membris dividentibus ens, etiam si sint maxime simplices entitates… quia, cum omnia entia *determinata* aliquo modo dividentia ens sint inter se distincta et plura obiective, non possunt intelligi convenire in unum obiectivum conceptum nisi saltem secundum rationem fiat praecisio et abstractio a propriis rationibus in quibus distinguuntur.

180 Hegel, *Science of Logic*, selections in Stephen Houlgate (ed.), *The Hegel Reader*, Blackwell, 1998, p. 187. "*Being* is the indeterminate *immediate*; it is free from determinateness in relation to *essence* and also from any which it can possess within itself. This reflectionless *being* is *being* as it is immediately in its own self alone.

Because it is indeterminate being, it lacks all quality; but *in itself*, the character of indeterminateness attaches to it only in contrast to what is *determinate* or qualitative, But *determinate* being stands in contrast to being in general, so that the very indeterminateness of the latter constitutes its quality. It will therefore be shown that the *first* being is in itself indeterminate, and therefore, *secondly*, that it passes into *determinate being* [*Dasein*]—is determinate being—but that this latter as finite being sublates itself and passes over into the infinite relation of being to its own self, that is, *thirdly*, into *being-for-self*."

would be dependent on something else. Hence all that we can actually conceptualize are *determinate* beings.

Finally, being for Suárez is also *immediate*, in that it is by itself directly and without any intervening medium constituted in *rerum natura* and outside nothing. For Hegel also, Being is immediate, and therefore too it is the beginning, of the process of the passing of being into non-being. "Their truth is, therefore, this movement of the immediate vanishing of the one in the other…."[181] And this movement is becoming. Becoming is thus the synthesis of being and non-being. Being must therefore be conceived as becoming. The concept of the Absolute as being is the concept of the Absolute as becoming.

4. Schopenhauer

Hegelianism's collapse was not followed by the creation of rival metaphysical systems, but what may be called anti-metaphysical philosophies, two of which still retain the some of the comprehensiveness of their displaced rival, the philosophies of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. Arthur Schopenhauer's (1788-1860) basic category is a comprehensive will, but a will that is devoid of conscience, no more than a blind driving force. Schopenhauer's thought can be described as *a perversion of metaphysics*. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), questioned the very rationale of metaphysics, and found that it can only be justified by being based on man, the lone being for whom metaphysics was, so to speak, invented. Nietzsche's thought can thus be described as the *inversion of metaphysics*. Be that as it may, the thought of these men, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, was in one way or another, affected by that of Suárez.

Some of Hegel's ideas sound like those found in classical Indian metaphysics and theology: indeed, the 19th century, which was Hegel's, was when German philosophy was exposed to Indian thought, and favorably so. In Schopenhauer we have a German thinker who confessed to being so exposed, who claimed that the foundations of his system were Plato and the *Upanisads*. Indeed the system felt the impact of Hindu theology, particularly the Monist Vedanta, to which he had been introduced by his Orientalist friend Friedrich Maier. Thus Schopenhauer is the creator of a system that is a strange amalgam of philosophies, but also one conditioned by a continued study of Kant.

181 Hegel, *Science of Logic*, selections in Houlgate (ed.), *The Hegel Reader*, p. 188.

Like Indian philosophy, Schopenhauer was preoccupied with the problem of the One and the Many, how a primordial unity evolved into a plurality of manifestations; how difference exists between individual entities, and seems to belie the monistic unity behind them. Schopenhauer believed he found the answer, not in Hindu thought, but (of all places) in Suárez's *principium individuationis*.

Most Vedantic systems, for their part, are concerned more with critiquing than in defending difference.[182] A prominent exception is the Dualist Vedantin Madhva (1238-1317), who justifies difference through the principle of the Specific (*visesa*),[183] as he calls it, a theory similar to the Scotist *haecceitas*.

Like most Vedantic systems, Schopenhauer viewed reality as bipolar, an undifferenced unity and a differentiated plurality. The undifferenced unity is described as the One, Primordial Unity and Thing-in-Itself (which Kant said was unknowable); and the Many, as Individuation and Phenomena. Primordial Unity is reality's inner, and phenomena its outer, dimension. Itself free of multiplicity, outside the realm of sufficient reason, and of space and time, this Unity is objectified into innumerable manifestations which are subordinate to that principle, while leaving the Will itself unaffected. The Unity is dynamic; it is blind impulse, endlessly striving; it is eternal becoming, and the Will-to-be or the Will-to-life.

Outside the Primordial Unity the principle of sufficient reason holds sway. Wolff had formulated the principle as follows: "Nothing is without sufficient reason why it should be rather than not be. That is, if something is posited as existing, there has also to be posited something, whence is understood, why that same thing be rather than not be."[184] That principle justifies the multiplicity of phenomena and explains the existence of space and time, the two forms of the principle

182 See Sri Harsa, "Critique of Difference," pp. 206-208 of José Pereira, *Hindu Theology. A Reader.* Garden City, NY, 1976. Indian edition *Hindu Theology. Themes, Texts & Structures.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991. Both editions have the same pagination.

183 See Jayatirtha (c. 1335-1385), "Specifics, the Nuances Innate to Identity," in José Pereira, *Hindu Theology. A Reader* or *Hindu Theology. Themes, Texts & Structures.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991, pp. 141-147.

184 Wolff, *Ontologia*, § 70, p. 47: Nihil est sine ratione sufficiente, cur potius sit quam non sit, hoc est, si aliquid esse ponitur, Ponendum est etiam aliquid, under intelligitur, cur idem potius sit, quam non sit.

of individuation. Phenomena thus constitute the appearance of the one metaphysical Will.

The uncultured individual sees not the thing-in-itself, but the phenomenon in space and time, the *principium individuationis*, and the other forms of the principle of sufficient reason.[185] He does not see the inner nature of things, which is one, but its phenomena are separated, disunited, innumerable, different and opposed.

What has this to do with Suárez? The *Doctor Eximius* supplied Schopenhauer with a term—individuation—that forms the very crux of his philosophy. Four texts in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* taught Schopenhauer what he wanted to know. These texts, which Schopenhauer explicitly mentions, are as follows: disputation 3, section 3 [*Quibus principiis demonstrari possint passiones de ente, et an inter ea hoc sit primum 'Impossibile est idem simul esse et non esse'*: By which principles it is possible to demonstrate the properties of being, and whether the following is the first principle, 'It is impossible for the same thing both to be and not be']; disputation 5, section 3 [*Utrum materia signata (quantitate) sit individuationis principium in substantiis materialibus*; Whether matter affected (by quantity) is the principle of individuation in material things]; disputation 15, section 1 [*An dentur in rebus materialibus substantiales formae*; Whether in material things there are given substantial forms] and disputation 25, section 1 [*An sit, quid sit, et ubi sit exemplar*; Whether there is an exemplar, what and where it is].

We may here recall the two-tiered concept of being in Suárez; the unified, interfused concept, where all particulars coalesce into one, and are signified only implicitly; and the same concept more sharply

185 Arthur Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Idea*, translated by R. B. Haldane & J. Kemp. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1948, book 4, p. 454-455: But the sight of the uncultured individual is clouded, as the Hindus say, by the veil of Maya. He does not see the thing-in-itself but the phenomenon in time and space, the *principium individuationis*, and in the other forms of the principle of sufficient reason. And in this form of his limited knowledge he sees not the inner nature of things, which is one, but its phenomena as separated, disunited, innumerable, very different, and indeed opposed… Just as a sailor sits in a boat trusting to his frail barque in a stormy sea, unbounded in every direction, rising and falling wit the howling mountainous waves; so in the world of sorrows the individual man sits quietly, supported by and trusting to the *principium individuationis*, or the way in which the individual knows things as phenomena.

focused, *per maiorem expressionem*, as particular kinds of being, including individuals are. The interfused concept which (as an abstraction) lacks the singularity of existent things, can be anamorphically identified as Schopenhauer's Primordial Unity, and the more sharply focused concepts into Schopenhauer's individuated phenomena.

5. Nietzsche

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), was the acerbic critic of the Christian "slave morality" and the prophet of a new heroic morality, that of the "superman" raised above the herd of inferior humanity, living a life of experience beyond the conventional standards of good and evil. Like his mentor Schopenhauer, Nietzsche too was impressed by Monist Vedanta philosophy, to which he was introduced by his Orientalist friend Paul Deussen. Nietzsche accepted Schopenhauer's bipolar classification of reality—with the unity pole being Primordial Unity and the multiplicity pole being the phenomena—but denied that the unity pole was transcendent with respect to the multiplicity pole. In other words, Primordial Unity, characterized as Will-to-Power, had no existence apart from its manifestations.

Yet there is an ineluctable difference between the two poles. Primordial Unity is represented by the impulsive, instinctive and irrational Dionysus, and the Phenomena, by the measured, rational, and restrained Apollo, the apotheosis and the transfiguring genius of the *principium individuationis*. Each of these two gods has his own characteristic experience. The intoxicating Dionysian experience is unified, centered on the Will to Power, penetrating into the innermost core of things, the eternal life beyond the phenomena; it is the one form of causal activity that unifies vital phenomena, and redeems from the *principium individuationis*. The Apollonian experience, on the other hand, is multiple, made up with the manifestations of the Will, appearances through which the original Unity is redeemed. Redemption achieved, the individual is annihilated; he experiences the joy of annihilation through music. Under the mystical cry of exultation of Dionysus, the spell of individuation is burst apart and torn asunder, and the path to the innermost core of things lies open.[186]

186 Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*. A New Translation by Douglas Smith. Oxford University Press 2000.

CHAPTER 7
THE IMPACT OF SUÁREZ ON THE EMPIRICISTS

I. TOPICS PERTINENT TO THE FORMAL CONCEPT
1. Rejection of Scholastic terminology
2. Empiricism
3. Nominalism
4. Conceptualism

II. TOPICS PERTINENT TO THE OBJECTIVE CONCEPT
1. Definition of essence
2. Distinction between existence and subsistence
3. Analogy
4. Substance and modes

Compared to the influence of Suárez on the Rationalists of the European continent, his impact on the British empiricists was less powerful, and less controversial. Both the empiricists and the Scholastic agreed on the primacy of the individual, but not on the universals which were frequently held to be no more than names. They also disagreed on the Scholastic method, which for the empiricists was an exercise of tedious and tortuous speculation, but Suárez believed that it was "the most apt for drawing truth out of darkness, and for assailing errors the most efficacious," *ad veritatem e tenebris eruendam aptissima est et ad impugnandos errores efficacissima*.[1]

I. TOPICS PERTINENT TO THE FORMAL CONCEPT

1. Rejection of Scholastic terminology

Among the empiricist critics of Scholasticism, and a particularly acerbic one, was Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). In his view its terminology was gibberish, to the extent that the Scholastics themselves were

1 *Defensio fidei Catholicae et apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*. Proemium [24: 2-3].

unable to make sense of their own jargon. As an example he quotes from a little-known opusculum of Suárez, *De concursu, motione et auxilio Dei*, lib. 1, cap. 6, whose title reads as follows.: *Causam primam nihil necessario influere in secundam, ex vi subordinationis essentialis causae secundae ad primam, quo illam ad agendum juvat*. "That the first cause, through the fact that the secondary cause is essentially subordinate to the first, does not necessarily have any influx on the secondary cause, by which it aids it to act." In other words, secondary causes, like the human free will, are essentially subordinate to and dependent on, the first cause, divine omnipotence, needing its continual causal influx or concurrence to continue to *exist*. But they need no added influx in order to *act*. They can act of themselves without any special help from God.[2] (Hobbes could have taken this occasion to extol the laconic character of Latin, its unmatched capacity for expressing the most complex thought with the fewest possible words.)

Yet, notwithstanding his anti-Scholastic bias, Hobbes, particularly in his early works, made ample use of Scholastic vocabulary, like "power" in the sense of "potency, inherent accidents, inherent form, quality inherent," and the like. Indeed, he anamorphized Suárez's terms and made them express un-Suarezian ideas.

A more sophisticated critic was John Locke (1632-1704), who observed that human language being imperfect as it is, it was reprehensible to burden it further with faults like affected obscurity, which he said that the Scholastics,

> aiming at glory and esteem for their great and universal knowledge, easier a great deal to be pretended than really acquired, found this a good expedient to cover their ignorance with a curious and inexplicable web of perplexed words and procure to themselves the admiration of others by unintelligible terms, the apter to produce wonder because they could not be understood….[3]

Another censurer of Scholastic language was George Berkeley (1685-1753) who speaks of the "mysterious jargon of Scholasticism; than which there could never have been contrived a more effectual method to perplex and confound human understanding."[4] The pious

2 *De concursu, motio, et auxilio Dei*, lib. 1, cap. 6, title of chapter [11: 25].

3 John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* [1689-1690], book 3, chapter, 10, n. 8.

4 George Berkeley, *Alciphron*, dialogue 5, n. 24, p. 224.

bishop declared that the Scholastics were "great masters of abstraction,"[5] and that their doctrine of abstract natures led them into all the manifold inextricable labyrinths of error and dispute." Familiarity with Scholastic terminology was evidently not a specialty with the British empiricists.

2. Empiricism

For Locke, as for Suárez, our ideas originate in sense-perception, but knowledge is not restricted to the immediate data of experience. Like the Scholastics, Locke repudiated the doctrine of innate ideas, and believed that the mind is born blank, a *tabula rasa* on which the world describes itself through the experience of the five senses. He writes:

> Let us then suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper void of all characters, without any ideas. How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it by that vast store which the busy and boundless fancy of man has painted on it with an almost endless variety? Whence has it all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from experience; in that all our knowledge is founded, and from that it ultimately derives itself.[6]

Experience was central to Locke's thinking; he was critical of any term that was not expressible on the basis of actual or possible experiences. Knowledge arising from sensation is perfected by reflection, thus enabling man to arrive at ideas like space, time and infinity. Reasoning of this kind makes the British empiricist's philosophy seem like a watered-down Scholasticism, with Cartesian elements thrown in, the whole sometimes confusedly and inconsistently expressed. Indeed, Locke's philosophy shows the Scholastic categories disintegrating under the empiricist impact, with confusion as the consequence.

3. Nominalism

All empiricists are Nominalists, but a wayward British medical doctor and self-confessed follower of Suárez, Francis Glisson (1597-1677),[7] came to Nominalism through his medical practice. It was

5 Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, vol. 1, n. 17, p. 249.

6 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* [1689-1690], book 2, ch. 1, n. 2.

7 Adelino Cardoso, "A viragem glissoniana do pensamento de Francisco Suárez," in Adelino Cardoso *et al.*, *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Tradição e*

medicine that led him to metaphysics, the metaphysics of the singular. [Locke doubtless had a similar experience, as he was also a student of medicine.] The medical science cannot afford the luxury of reified universals, for each patient is a singularity, an individual with an individual's problems. The physician must study the character of the patient, the uniqueness of his biography, and the particular circumstances affecting his life.

Having focused on the singular, Glisson declares that it is existence devoid of essence. Essence responds to the question, "*What* is it?" (*quid est?*: hence "quiddity"). But existence is the fact *that* a thing is (*quod est*: hence Glisson's strange neologism "quoddity"). "Quoddity contains the full intelligible content of being, and its very quiddity consists in the fact that it is" (*totam entis rationem absolvit… ipsaque quidditas eiusdem consistit in eo quod est*).[8]

The act of existence finds its perfection in substance, and the essence of substance is subsistence. Subsistence for Glisson is not just a mode, as Suárez would have it, but the fundamental essence of substantial nature (*fundamentalis essentia naturae substantialis*).[9] In fact, substance and subsistence are identical. Subsistence separates each being from all other beings; each such being experiences itself in self-perception—a perception that manifests that substance's energetic nature insofar as it is the source of inspiration, exercising itself in the different levels of life, including the most elementary ones. The goal of this substance is self-fruition—*naturae substantialis fruitio sui*.[10]

4. Conceptualism

Locke and Suárez both have similar ideas about universals. Both agree that whatever exists is singular or particular, and not some (hypostatized or reified) common nature. Individuals know singulars first, and on the basis of similarities between the singulars mentally construct general notions or universals. Consequently these constructions, al-

modernidade.Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 207-222.

8 Francis Glisson, *Disquisitiones Metaphysicae*, cap. 3, p. 136. Quoted by Cardoso, *op.cit*. p. 219.

9 Glisson, *De natura substantiae energetica* [1672], 5: 4. Cardoso, p. 220, footnote 26.

10 Glisson, *De natura substantiae energetica*, 4: 32. Cardoso, p. 221.

though produced by the mind, are not baseless fictions, but have a foundation in reality.

To begin with, both philosophers agree that what exists in reality is always singular or particular. For Suárez,, "Everything that exists is necessarily singular and individual."[11] and for Locke, "universality belongs not to the things themselves, which are all of them particular in their existence...."[12] The experience of simple peasants and children shows that what the mind first knows is the singular. (They certainly do not know the universal first, and then, through reflection, descend to the singular.) When these individuals have become aware of singular realities for some time, they notice similarities between some, and on the basis of those (objectively existent) similarities, construct general notions. Suárez concurs with this view:

> Our intellect directly knows the material singulars without reflection...[13] before anyone knows to reflect descending from universal nature to singulars, he knows the singulars. The rustic, for instance, knows Peter, and other individual things, and reasons about them immediately, while he absolutely has no knowledge of universal natures, which even the educated man is able to experience for himself, if he considers the manner in which he knew singulars, before he studied philosophy, or even dialectics.[14]... uneducated persons, who see but one sun, form concepts of only one sun, they form no concept of sun in common, but only of the one which they see.[15]

---

11 *DM* 6: 2: 2; 25 [6: 206]: Omnis res quae existit, necessario est singulare et individua.

12 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* [1689-1690], book 3, chapter. 3, n. 11.

13 *De anima* 4: 3: 7 [3: 724]: Intellectus noster cognoscit directe singularia materialia absque reflexione....

14 *De anima* 4: 3: 8 [3: 724]: antequam sciat unusquisque reflecti descendendo a natura universali a singularia, novit ipsa singularia. Rusticus enim cognovit Petrum, resque caeteras individuas, ac circa illas ratiocinatur immediate, cum prorsus ignoret naturas universales, quod etiam doctus quilibet valet in se experiri, si consideret modum quo singularia noverat, antequam philosophiam perdisceret, aut etiam dialecticam...

15 *De anima* 4: 3: 15 [2: 727]: rudes, qui unicum vident solem, conceptus solis in communi non formant, sed illius tantum quem vident...

Similarities that exist between individual entities are the basis of the abstraction whereby the mind constructs universals. In the Doctor's words,

> for the unity of the formal concept it is enough that on part of the object the fundamental unity of the objective concept is presupposed, a unity that consists in the similitude or concordance of many singulars in a formal unity; for this is enough so that the intellect by its power and efficacy to understand can abstract a common objective concept….[16]

For Locke, too, the knowledge of the singular comes first, and is the basis for the creation of common concepts:

> There is nothing more evident than that the ideas of the persons children converse with … are, like the persons themselves, only particular. The ideas of the nurse and the mother are well framed in their minds, and… represent only those individuals. The names they first gave to them are confined to these individuals… Afterwards, when time and a larger acquaintance have made them observe that there are a great many other things in the world that, in some common agreements of shape and several other qualities, resemble their father and mother and those persons they have been used to, they frame an idea which they find those many particulars do partake in; and to that they give, with others, the name *man*, for example. And thus they come to have a general name, and a general idea. Wherein they make nothing new, but only leave out of the complex idea they had of Peter and James, Mary and Jane that which is peculiar to each, and retain only what is common to them all.[17]

Universals for Suárez do not exist in reality; they are mental constructs and

16 *DM* 6: 3: 11 [25: 216]: respondetur, ad unitatem conceptus formalis satis esse ut ex parte obiecti supponatur unitas fundamentalis conceptus obiectivi, quae consistit in similitudine seu convenientia plurium singularium in unitate formali; nam hoc satis est ut intellectus sua vi et efficacia intelligendi possit abstrahere conceptum obiectivum communem.

17 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 3, chapter 3, n. 7.

> natures become universal in actuality only by the operation of the intellect, with some foundation being presupposed on part of the things themselves….[18]

Locke too maintains that universals are inventions of the mind, that

> general and universal belong not to the real existence of things, but are the inventions and creatures of the understanding, made by it for its own use, and concern only signs, whether of words or ideas. Words are general… when used for signs of general ideas,… and ideas are general when they are set up as the representatives of many particular things; but universality belongs not to things themselves, which are all of them particular in their existence.[19]

But he admits that universals are not pure fictions but are guided by similarities that exist among things independently of our minds; he would not deny that

> nature, in the production of things, makes several of them alike... But yet I think we may say the sorting of them under names is the workmanship of the understanding, taking occasion, from the similitude it observes amongst them, to make abstract general ideas, and set them up in the mind... as patterns.[20]

Suárez, for his part, asks how objective reality, that only consists of singulars, can be the basis for the mental construct of a common nature, which is indifferent to many singulars, and cannot itself exist in reality: he responds that the basis lies in objective reality itself, for

> although in each individual nature is determined to that individual alone, nonetheless it exists in that particular individual in such a way that by its power existence in another similar being is not incompatible with it, or rather for a similar nature to exist in another individual; and this alone is the sufficient foundation of its indifference and aptitude to exist in many individuals, which is in the

18 *DM* 6: 2: 8 [25: 203]: naturas fieri actu universales solum opere intellectus, praecedente fundamento aliquo ex parte ipsarum rerum.

19 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 3, chapter 3, n. 11.

20 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 3, chapter 3, n. 13.

> common nature as abstracted by the intellect, and is not any indetermination which nature has of itself or in individuals.[21]

In other words, as both philosophers agree, the *similitude* between individuals makes possible the abstraction responsible for the creation of universals.

Existence, for Suárez, is the actuality of individual natures and is wholly identical with them; this actuality is broadly described as "existence." Combined with these actualized natures are their limits, distinct from those natures, which establish them as independent things through a mode of being identified as "subsistence" (*per se existentia*). Subsistence is thus no more than a particular mode of existence, expressive of a higher grade of reality than mere "existence." Suárez writes:

> substantial nature however, which exists by itself, besides the actual entity of essence, includes some ultimate limit, by which it positively subsists… which limit we now also suppose to be distinct through the nature of the thing to be distinct from the actual entity of the whole nature, or of substantial essence. We deny that this same terminus is existence, but [maintain that it is] the subsistence of nature or its supposit.[22]

For Berkeley the basic category of metaphysics is thing or being, subdivided into two entirely distinct and heterogeneous varieties, spirits and ideas. Spirits are active, indivisible substances. Ideas however are inert, fleeting, dependent beings which subsist not by themselves, but are supported by, or exist in, minds or spiritual substances. The substance of souls is the consciousness of ideas, the perceptual identification of ideas as real beings. The act of perceiving identifies a thing

21 *DM* 6: 4: 12 [25: 221]: licet in unoquoque individuo natura sit determinata ad illud tantum, nihilominus ita est in illo, ut ex vi eius non repugnet esse in alio simili, seu potius similem naturam esse in alio individuo; et hoc solum est fundamentum sufficiens eius indifferentiae et aptitudinis essendi in multis, quae est in communi natura ut abstracta per intellectum, et non est indeterminatio aliqua quam natura ipsa ex se vel in individuis habeat

22 *DM* 31: 5: 5 [26: 238]: Substantialis autem natura, quae per se existit, praeter actualem entitatem essentiae, includit ultimum quemdam terminum, quo positive subsistit... Quem terminum nunc etiam supponimus ex natura rei distinctum ab entitate actuali totius naturae, seu essentiae substantialis. Hunc item terminum negamus esse existentiam, sed subsistentiam naturae seu suppositi.

and constitutes the existence of the idea. The activity is not the same as the things it produces, so spirits do not "exist" but "subsist."[23] Berkeley applies this distinction to his basic categories of thought—ideas and mind—which possess a sense quite alien to Suárez. Ideas have existence, while mind has subsistence: indeed, the subsistence of a mind is none other than the existence of its ideas. These Suarezian categories enable Berkeley to avoid making the mind a substratum that can exist apart from the ideas it generates.

II. TOPICS PERTINENT TO THE OBJECTIVE CONCEPT

1. Definition of essence

Another of Locke's doctrines, which reflects Scholastic thinking, particularly in its Suarezian mode, and from which a number of his most provocative theses are derived, is the definition of essence. Locke classifies essence as nominal and real. Suárez also distinguishes two meanings of essence—as we know it (*in ordine ad nostrum modum concipiendi et loquendi*, corresponds to *quidditas*), and as it is in itself (*in ordine ad effectus vel passiones rei*, corresponds to *natura*).[24]

For Locke, *nominal essence* is the essence of a thing in so far as it is presented to the mind, a set of qualities that determines its kind. It consists of abstract ideas about a thing signified by words, and to which a general name is attached. Nominal essence may also be described as a complex idea which sets the criteria for identifying members of a kind and which gives the definition of the name of that kind. For Suárez, essence, *quoad nos*, is what

> is explained by a definition… that is of the essence of a thing, which we conceive first to pertain to it and to first constitute it in the being of the thing, or of such a thing, and in this way essence is also called 'quiddity' in relation to our modes of speaking, because it is that by which we respond to the question "what is that thing.[25]

23 Stephen H. Daniel, "Berkeley, Suárez, and the *Esse-Existere* Distinction," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 74 (4), 2000, pp. 621-636.

24 *DM* 2: 4: 6 [25: 89].

25 *DM* 2: 4: 6 [25: 89]: per definitionem explicatur… id est de essentia rei, quod concipimus primo illi convenire et primo constitui in esse rei, vel

For Locke, *real essence* is the very being of a thing, objective and mind-independent, whereby it is what it is; the internal (but unknown) constitution of things whereon their observable or discoverable qualities depend. For Suárez, essence, *in se*, is also "that which is the first, radical and intimate principle of all the actions and properties that pertain to it, and under this meaning it is said to be the nature of every particular thing."[26] [For a detailed exposé of Suárez's notion of essence, see Chapter 3, section IV, no. 5, *Essentia realis*.]

2. Distinction between existence and subsistence

Existence, for Suárez, is the positing of entity or nature outside causes, dependent or independent of another. What is dependent upon or sustained by another is accident, and what is independent of and itself sustaining another is subsistence. Subsistence is thus no more than a particular mode of existence, expressive of a higher grade of reality than mere "existence." Suárez writes:

> substantial nature however, which exists by itself, besides the actual entity of essence, includes some ultimate limit, by which it positively subsists… which limit we now also suppose, through the nature of the thing, to be distinct from the actual entity of the whole nature, or of substantial essence. We deny that this same terminus is existence, but [maintain that it is] the subsistence of nature or its supposit.[27]

Berkeley applies the distinction between existence and subsistence to his basic categories of thought—ideas and mind—which possess a sense quite alien to Suárez.

---

talis rei, et hoc modo etiam vocatur essentia quidditas in ordine ad locutiones nostras, quia est id per quod respondemus ad quaestionem, quid sit res.

26 *DM* 2: 4: 6 [25: 89]: id quod est primum et radicale, aut intimum principium omnium actionum et proprietatum quae rei conveniunt, et sub hac ratione dicitur natura uniuscuiusque rei.

27 *DM* 31: 5: 5 [26: 238]: Substantialis autem natura, quae per se existit, praeter actualem entitatem essentiae, includit ultimum quemdam terminum, quo positive subsistit... Quem terminum nunc etiam supponimus ex natura rei distinctum ab entitate actuali totius naturae, seu essentiae substantialis. Hunc item terminum negamus esse existentiam, sed subsistentiam naturae seu suppositi.

The impact that Suárez had on Berkeley relates to the former's theory of distinctions, the well-known disputation 7. There Suárez speaks of "precisive" abstraction. Berkeley's use of the word "prescind" appears to have been borrowed from Suárez. Precisive abstraction, for Berkeley is "the division of things truly inseparable."[28] In other words, it is *distinctio rationis cum fundamento in re*. Berkeley mocks the word "support" in the thesis that substances support their qualities. Locke, too, derided the suggestion that substances support qualities. "Support" cannot be meant in its usual sense, Berkeley remarks, and no unusual one has been explained.

> Though you know not what it is, yet you must be supposed to know what relation bears to accidents, and what is meant by supporting them. It is evident support cannot here be taken in its usual or literal sense, as when we say that pillars support a building: in what sense therefore must it be taken? [29]

3. Analogy

Another theme that connects Suárez with Berkeley is that of *analogy*. Speaking of God and His attributes, the Irish bishop refers to the views of Scholastics on the subject, two of whom are mentioned by name, Aquinas and Suárez. " "Suárez," writes Berkeley, "with other Schoolmen, teacheth that the mind of man conceiveth knowledge and will to be in God as faculties or operations, by analogy only to created beings…" But this knowledge is not "like the imperfect kind found in creatures;" the imperfections, however, are not intrinsic to knowledge "in its proper formal sense" and so can be attributed to God. Berkeley is apparently referring to the *DM* 30: 15: 2 [26: 170], where Suárez remarks that these "imperfections are material, as it were, created in human or angelic knowledge; they really do not belong to the formal significance of knowledge as such" *imperfectiones quasi materiales sunt, inventae in scientia humana vel angelica; non vero pertinent ad rationem formalem scientiae ut sic*… The "proper formal sense" of knowledge "signifies a clear, evident and perfect cognition or perception of the truth, or of the knowable object," *significat claram et evidentem ac perfectam cognitionem seu perceptionem veritatis, seu objecti scibilis*...."

28 Berkeley, *De motu*, sect. 47.

29 Berkeley, *Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* [1710], 16.

4. Substance and modes

But the most contentious (and greatly influential) of all Scholastic, especially Suarezian, doctrines was that of substance and modes. We saw how left its mark on the thinking of Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz. Now Locke. Both the Scholastic and the Empiricist use the same criterion to distinguish these two categories of being; for both, substance has two meanings, substance proper and substratum.

For Locke, *substance proper* is any entity (like man, sheep, gold) that is subsistent in itself, and, in order to exist, requires no entity of any other category, but only what is dictated by the laws of nature. Ideas of substances, Locke writes, are "distinct particular things subsisting by themselves, in which the supposed or confused idea of substance, such as it is, is always considered the first and chief."[30] An example is a table, an artifact that is subject to the laws of nature insofar as it has mass, and is made of wood, but not insofar as it is a table. Tables could not exist if there were no substances like wood or metal out of which they could be made, but it is not a law of nature that tables be made of any particular material.

The other meaning of substance is *substratum*, the unknown support of qualities (causal powers) and properties (non-causal powers). "The idea then we have, to which we give the general name substance, being nothing but the supposed, but unknown, support of those qualities we find existing, which we imagine cannot exist *sine re substante*, without something to support them, we call that support *substantia*; which, according to the true import of the word, is, in plain English, standing under or upholding."[31] Locke finds it hard to validate the notion of substratum by an intelligible derivation from sensory ideas, and has a clear and distinct significance. The collections of qualities and properties experienced in everyday life are imagined as not subsisting of themselves, but to be supported by "something besides," by an undifferentiated entity that is "other than" its qualities and properties. It is interesting to compare the reasoning of Suárez in support of the existence of substance (and accidents):

---

30 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 2, chapter 12, n. 6.

31 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 2, chapter 23, n. 2.

> Hence, that some among created things are substances, some in fact accidents, is manifest from the continuous mutation and alteration; for water, for example, changes from hot to cold, and vice versa; a man now sits, and now walks, by which changes something of the thing must of necessity be lost, or gained, or else there would be no real change: the substance of water, or of the man, remains whole, whether water is warm or heated whether the man sits or walks; it is therefore an accident in which the change takes place: it is given in entities therefore that some are accidents. Hence furthermore it is necessary concluded that a certain being is substance, or that the accident is that of something, that is, of a substance.[32]

Dependent on substances for their existence are modes, phenomena which are not dictated by any laws of nature. Locke clearly differentiates substances from ideas of them, but often collapses "ideas of modes" into "modes" (thus seeming to reflect the Suarezian idea of the exiguousness of the mode's entity). Says Locke, "Modes I call such complex ideas which, however compounded, contain not in them the supposition of subsisting by themselves, but are considered as dependencies on, or affections of substances."[33]

Ultimately, Locke thinks, we know little of what substance really is.

> If anyone should be asked what is the subject wherein colour or weight inheres, he would have nothing to say but, the solid extended parts; and if he were demanded what is it that that solidity and extension adhere in, he would not be in a much better case than the Indian… who, saying that the world was supported by a great elephant, was asked what that elephant rested on, to which his answer was, a great tortoise; but being again pressed to know what gave support to the broad-backed tortoise, replied, something he

32 *DM* 32: 1: 4 [26: 313]: Quod ergo in rebus creatis quaedam sint substantiae, quaedam vero accidentia, ex ipsa continua rerum mutatione et alteratione manifestum est; mutatur enim aqua, verbi gratia, ex calida in frigidam, et e converso, et homo nunc sedet, nunc vero ambulat, per quas mutationes aliquid rei amitti vel acquiri necesse est, alioqui non fieret mutatio realis; non amittitur autem nec mutatur substantia; integra enim manet substantia aquae vel hominis, sive calefiat, sive frigefiat, sedeat aut ambulet; est ergo accidens illud in quo fit mutatio; dantur ergo in entibus quaedam quae sunt accidentia. Unde ulterius necessario concluditur, aliquod esse ens quod sit substantia; nam accidens alicuius est accidens, nimirum substantiae.

33 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 2, chapter 12, n. 4.

> knew not what. And thus here, as in all other cases where we use words without having clear and distinct ideas, we talk like children who, being questioned what such a thing is which they know not, readily give this satisfactory answer, that it is something; which in truth signifies no more, when so used, either by children or men, but that they know not what….[34]

Berkeley strikes a middle way between the Aristotelian categories and Suárez's more complex metaphysical account of reality by his threefold division of ideas: of substances, modes and relations.

The notion of substance and modes, which was already decaying in Locke, now disintegrates with David Hume (1711-1776). According to his understanding of substance, each existing thing is composed of an underlying substratum (primary substance), which, having received an essential form (secondary substance), is then further modified by several non-essential features (variously known as modes, accidents, properties, attributes or qualities) that are said to inhere in the substance. Thus an apple consists of such a substratum modified by the essential form, apple, and such specific accidents or properties as color, shape, weight and texture.

Hume argues that we experience only the accidents or qualities of things; substance itself is never experienced and hence we have no clear idea of it. Locke had made exactly the same point, and claimed that the term substance refers merely to an obscure something (what we might call a logical subject) underlying the set of particular qualities an object is perceived to have. We have clear ideas of the color, shape, weight, taste and texture of the apple we are eating, but of its substance we can only say that it is "something, I know not what."

Hume's philosophy is of course based on the empiricist assumption that "since nothing is ever present to the mind but perceptions, and since all ideas are derived from something antecedently present to the mind, it follows, that it is impossible for us so much as to conceive or form an idea of anything specifically different from ideas and impressions."[35] This tenet provides Hume with the reasoning, based on two principles, that voids the concept of substance of any significance.

---

34 Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, book 2, chapter 23, n.2.

35 David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, book 1, part 2, sect. 6. David Fate Norton & Mary J. Norton (eds), Oxford University Press, 2000. p. 49. Spelling modernized.

First principle: "Whatever is clearly conceived may exist; and whatever is clearly conceived, after any manner, may exist after the same manner." Second principle: "Again, every thing, which is different, is distinguishable, and every thing which is distinguishable, is separable by the imagination." Conclusion: "since all our perceptions are different from each other, and from everything else in the universe, they are also distinct and separable, and may be considered as separately existent, and may exist separately, and have no need of anything else to support their existence. They are, therefore, substances, as far as this definition explains a substance."[36]

However, whatever Hume may think of the concept of substance, he has no doubts about the universality of the notions of existence or being. In his view, whatever can be conceived includes the idea of existence: every perception, considered as a perception, is conceived as existing. In his own words:

> There is no impression nor idea of any kind, of which we have any consciousness or memory, that is not conceived as existent; and it is evident, that from this consciousness the most perfect idea and assurance of being is derived.[37]

So, while deeply disagreeing on the matter of substance, the preeminent Empiricist would strangely be in agreement with the preeminent Scholastic that, in the latter's words, "existence, as existence, corresponds to being as such, and pertains to its intrinsic significance," *existentia ut existentia correspondet enti ut sic, estque de intrinseca ratione eius....*[38]

36 Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, book 1, part 4, sect. 5, p. 153.

37 Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, book 1, part 2, sect. 6, p. 48.

38 *DM* 50: 12: 15 [26: 969].

EPILOGUE

> Suárez enjoys a knowledge of medieval philosophy as to put to shame any modern historian of medieval thought. On each and every question he seems to know everybody and every thing, and to read his book is like attending the Last Judgment of four centuries of Christian speculation, always willing to give everyone a chance, supremely apt at summing up a case and, unfortunately, so anxious as not to hurt equity that a moderate verdict is most likely to be considered a true verdict.[1]

To conclude. If the argument of this book holds, we will have witnessed one of the great anomalies in the history of thought: of one thinker functioning in two contrary roles, each reversing the other. The role of being, on the one hand, the consummator of one phase of philosophical speculation, the realist; and on the other, the initiator (though an unwitting one) of another phase, the idealist. This shift from realism to idealism was the most crucial shift in the philosophy of Europe (and perhaps the world); it inaugurated an era of irrepressible, if chaotic, creativity.

On the one side, *cosmos*, the climax of a tradition of four centuries (if not of over a millennium), embodied in the most massive work of systematics in the history of speculation, the 21-million word Suarezian synthesis;[2] on the other, *chaos*, the rise of a plethora of systems, anti-systems and non-systems in a mad sequence of innovations and novelties, each appearing to cancel out the others, all seemingly hurtling toward the black holes of skepticism, anti-realism, relativism and nihilism itself. The anomaly is all the more striking because all this wildfire was presumably set alight by a little word "better known" (*notior*), or, to put it less dramatically, by the truth of an objective concept made dependent on a subjective state of mind.[3]

At the Last Judgment of four centuries of the realist speculation of Scholasticism, there was found and was present a judge capable of delivering a serene and fair judgment on that tradition's confused but not anarchic mass of philosophies. That mild chaos was reduced to

---

1 Étienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, p. 99.

2 Cf. Prologue, sections I & II, and Chapter 1, section III.

3 Cf. Prologue, section IV and Chapter 3, Epilogue.

cosmos in the Suarezian synthesis. However when it comes the time to preside over a Last Judgment of the succeeding idealist philosophies, immensely more chaotic than the realist, will there be a judge of like comprehensiveness and impartiality: is it within the bounds of human capacity to reduce that chaos to cosmos, and would an intellect proportionate to the problem be found?

SUÁREZ BIBLIOGRAPHY

(*Generally lists only the title in which there is an explicit reference to Suárez or his philosophy*)

ABELLÁN, PEDRO MARÍA, "Posición de Suárez ante el conflicto entre la libertad y la obligación probable," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III 1949), pp. 33-59.

ABELLÁN, PEDRO MARÍA, "Semblanza del Padre Suárez como teólogo moralista," in *Actas del IV Centenario del Nacimiento de Francisco Suárez*, II, Burgos 1950, pp. 5-28.

ABRANCHES, C., "As verdades eternas e os possíveis na metafísica de Suárez," *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 4 (1948, número extraordinário), pp. 364-380.

ABRIL CASTELLÓ, V., "Derecho-Estado-Rey: monarquía y democracia en Francisco Suárez," *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 210 (1976), pp. 129-188.

ABRIL CASTELLÓ, V., La obligación política según Suárez: el deber de obediencia a las leyes," *Miscellanea Comillas* 67 (1977), pp. 229-296.

ABRIL CASTELLÓ, V., "L'obligation politique chez Suárez. Bilan et perspectives", *Archives de Philosophie* 42 (1979), pp. 179-203.

ABRIL CASTELLÓ, V., "Moral-Derecho-Política: homologación democrática y responsabilidad política en Francisco Suárez," *Anuario de Filosofia del Derecho* 19 (1976-1977), pp. 211-262.

ABRIL CASTELLÓ, V., "Perspectivas del iusnaturalismo suareciano", in *Corpus Hispanorum de Pace* XII, Madrid 1974, pp. LVI-LXXXVI.

ABRIL CASTELLÓ, V., "Suárez, padre de los derechos humanos," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 43-52.

ADURIZ, J., "Para el estudio de la criteriología suareciana," *Ciencia y Fe* 4 (Buenos Aires 1948), pp. 20-31. (Homenaje a Suárez.)

AGUIRRE, F., *De doctrina F. Suárez circa potestatem Ecclesiae in res temporales*, Lovaina 1935.

ALBENDEA, MANUEL, "Presencia de Suárez en la Filosofia de Rosmini," *Crisis. Revista Española de Filosofia* 2-6 (1955), pp. 149-254.

ALCORTA, JOSÉ IGNACIO, *La teoría de los modos en Suárez*, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas -Instituto Luis Vives, 1949. Cf. ID., *Revista Filosofica* 7-26 (Madrid 1948), pp. 443-497.

ALCORTA, JOSÉ IGNACIO, "Problemática de la existencia en Suárez," *Congreso Internacional de Filosofia de Barcelona 1948*. Madrid, 1949, *Actas* 2, pp. 599-619; *Revista de Filosofía*, 7-27 (1948).

ALCORTA, JOSÉ IGNACIO, "Problemática del tema de la creación en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948, número extraordinario), pp. 304-334.
ALDAMA, J. A. DE, "Dos pareceres inéditos del Padre Suárez sobre la gracia eficaz," *Archivo Teológico Granadino,* 11 (1948), pp. 226-270.
ALDAMA, J. A. DE, "El perfil teológico de Suárez y la primera generación científica de la Compañía de Jesús," *Razón y Fe* 138 (1948), pp. 265-283.
ALDAMA, J. A. DE, "El IV Centenario del Nacimiento del Padre Francisco Suárez", Boletin de la Historia de Teologia en el periodo 1500-1800, *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 12 (1949), pp. 332-361.
ALDAMA, J. A. DE, "Un parecer de Suárez sobre un estatuto de la Orden militar de Alcántara", *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 11 (1948), pp. 271-285.
ALDAMA, J. A. DE, "Un parecer inédito de Suárez sobre la doctrina de la gracia eficaz," *Estudios Eclesiasticos,* 22 (1948), pp. 495-505.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Esencia y valor del conocimiento humano según Francisco Suárez," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 Octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, I 1949), pp. 277-304.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Esencia y valor del conocimiento según el Doctor Eximio, *Miscelánea Comillas* 9 (1948, *Número extraordinario*), pp. 211-247.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Evidencia ye fe según el Doctor Eximio," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 22 (1948), pp.167-193.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Francisco Suárez filósofo," *Cristiandad* 5 (1948), pp. 371-373.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Gnoseología de lo singular según Suárez," *Pensamiento* 3 (1947), pp. 403-425; 4 (1948), pp. 131-152.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Gnoseología de lo universal en el Doctor Eximio y la dificultad criticista," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948), pp. 425-448.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "La filosofía del conocimiento en Suárez y Kant," in *Actas del 4 Centenario del Nacimiento de Francisco Suárez 1548-1948*, Madrid, Dirección General de Propaganda, I (1949), pp. 231-233.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "La gnoseologia del Doctor Eximio y la acusación nominalista," *Miscellanea Comillas* 9 (1948), pp. 211-247; *Razón y Fe* 139 (1949), pp. 508-510.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, *La gnoseologia del Doctor Eximio y la acusación nominalista*. Comillas: Pontificia Universitas Comillensis. Publicación aneja a 'Miscellaneas Comillas', Serie filosófica. 1948.
ALEJANDRO, JOSÉ MARÍA, "La personalidad científica del Doctor Eximio." En: *Miscellanea Comillas* 9 (1948), pp. 191-210.
ALEU BENITEZ, JOSÉ, "Juicio y objetivación en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 26 (1970), pp. 397-417.

ALONSO FUEYO, S., "Francisco Suárez o la armonía de una doctrina y de un sistema", *Saitabi* 6 (1948).

ÁLVAREZ ÁLVAREZ, FRANCISCO, *La teoria concordataria en Francisco Suárez*, Leon, Imprenta Católica, 1953.

ÁLVAREZ GOMEZ, MARIANO,"Sobre el concepto de individuo en F. Suárez," in ADELINO CARDOSO et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de Modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 45-64.

ÁLVAREZ GOMEZ, MARIANO, "La omnipotencia de Dios y el principio de contradicción en Francisco Suárez", in *Potentia Dei. L'onnipotentia divina nel pensiero dei secoli XVI e XVII*, edd. Guido Canziani, Miguel A. Granada, Yves Charles Zarka, Milano, Franco Angeli [Filosofia e Scienza nel Cinquecento e nel Seicento], 2000, 173-193.

ALVES, V. DE SOUSA, "A cosmologia suareziana," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 285-294.

AMBROSETTI, GIOVANNI, *Il diritto naturale della riforma cattolica. Una giustificazione storica del sistema di Suárez*, Milano: Dott. A. Giuffrè Editore, 1951.

AMBROSETTI, GIOVANNI, *La Filosofia delle Leggi di Suárez*, Roma, 1948.

ANDRÉS MARCOS, TEODORO, "Semblanza de Suárez", in *Homenaje al Dr. Exímio P. Suárez, S.J. en el IV Centenario de su Nacimiento* (*Acta Salmanticensia. Derecho*, I-2, 1948), 12-21.

ARBOLEYA, E. G., "La Filosofia de Derecho de Francisco Suárez en relación con sus supuestos metafísicos, *Escorial* 6 (1942), pp. 13-41.

ARBOLEYA, E. G., "Suárez y el mundo moderno," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943), pp. 167-194.

AREITIO, RAMÓN, "La escatología media en Suárez," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 40 (1977), pp. 47-79.

ARNAU, RAMÓN,"Nota sobre la noción de sacramento en Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

ASHWORTH, E. J., "Suárez on the Analogy of Being: Some Historical Background," *Vivarium* 33-1 (1995), pp. 50-75.

AUBENQUE, PIERRE, "Suárez et l'avènement du concept de l'être," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 11-20.

BACIERO, CARLOS, "Contexto filosófico del axioma 'actiones sunt suppositorum' en Suárez, Vázquez y Lugo," *Miscellanea Comillas* 50 (1968), pp. 21-36.

BACIERO, CARLOS, "Los problemas de la subsistencia creada in Suárez, Vázquez y Lugo," *Miscelánea Comillas* 57 (1972), pp. 205-243.

BACIERO, CARLOS, "Suárez y sus *Disputationes metaphysicae*. Importancia y significado histórico," *Arbor* 159 (1998), pp. 451-471.
BAENA, E. F., *Fundamentos metafísicos de la potencia obediencial en Suárez*. Medellin 1957.
BARALE, P.,"Critica del Rosmini alla definizione suareziana del concretto", *Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Filosofia* (Venezia 1958), vol. XII, *Storia della Filsofia Moderna e Contemporanea*, Firenze: Sansoni, 1960, pp. 9-16.
BARATA-MOURA, JOSÉ, "Uma nota sobre a praxis em Francisco Suárez," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 225-238.
BÁRCENA, FELIPE ALONSO, "El Padre Francisco Suárez y su obra teológica," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943).
BÁRCENA, FELIPE ALONSO, "El Padre Suárez profundo pensador, teólogo exímio, maestro de la filosofía del derecho," *El Debate* (Feb. 1934).
BÁRCENA, FELIPE ALONSO, "El perfil espiritual de Suárez," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 11 (1948), pp. 1-28.
BARRÓN, J. USCATESCU, "El concepto de metafísica en Suárez: su objeto y dominio," *Pensamiento* 51 (1995), pp. 251-236.
BARTRA, E. T.,"Francisco Suárez: la esencia del ente finito," *Ciencia y Fe* 6 (1950), pp. 85-97.
BARTRA, E. T., "Suárez y Santo Tomás en la prueba cinesiológica de la existencia de Dios," *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez,* Burgos (1949), I, pp. 307-325.
BASABE, FERNANDO, "Exposición suareciana de la causa instrumental," *Pensamiento* 16 (1960), pp. 189-223.
BASABE, FERNANDO, "Teoría tomista de la causa instrumental y la crítica suareciana," *Pensamiento* 16 (1960), pp. 5-40, 189-223.
BASTIT, MICHEL, "Interprétation analogique de la loi et analogie de l'être chez Suárez: de la similitude à l'identité", *Les Etudes Philosophiques*, 44 (1989), pp. 429-443.
BASTIT, MICHEL, *Naissance de la loi moderne. La pensée de la loi de saint Thomas à Suárez*, Paris, P.U.F. 1990 [Léviathan], IIIème partie: "Suárez ou la loi dialectique".
BATTLORI, MIQUEL, "Les fonds manuscrits de Suárez dans les bibliothèques et les archives de Rome," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los Filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 327-333.
BAUER, EMMANUEL J., "Francisco Suárez. Scholastik nach dem Humanismus," in *Philosophen der Renaissance*, ed. Paul Richard Blum, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999, pp. 206-221.

BELTRÁN, MIQUEL, "El Dios de Suárez y los espacios imaginarios," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 93-98.

BENAVENT VIDAL, ENRIQUE, *Amigos de Dios. El acontecimiento de la justificacion en el pensamiento de Suárez*, Valencia, 1995.

BENZO MESTRE, B., *La pura naturaleza humana en la teología de Suárez*. Madrid 1955.

BERGADA, M. M., "El aporte de Francisco Suárez a la filosofía moderna." En: *Actas del 1 Congreso Nacional de Filosofia de Mendoza* (Argentina), Mendoza 1950, III, pp. 1921-1926.

BERNAREGGI, A., "La personalitá scientifica di Dr. Suárez," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 10 (1918), pp. 6-36.

BEUCHOT, MAURÍCIO, "La esencia y la existencia en los escolásticos post-medievales. La lucha entre Francisco Suárez y Juan Martínez del Prado," *Doctor Communis* 45 (1992), pp. 153-161.

BEUCHOT, MAURÍCIO, "La ley natural en Suárez," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 279-288.

BEUCHOT, MAURÍCIO, "La substancia en la metafísica de Francisco Suárez," *Seminarios de Filosofía*, vol. 8. Pontifícia Universidad Católica de Chile. Date?

BLANCHETTE, OLIVA, "Suárez and the Latent Essentialism of Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology," *Review of Metaphysics* 53-1 (1999), pp. 3-19.

BONET, ALBERTO, *Doctrina de Suárez sobre la libertad*, Barcelona 1927.

BONILLA, SANMARTÍN, *Francisco Suárez. El escolástico tomista y el derecho internacional*, 1918.

BRACHTENDORF, JOHANNES, "Die Finalität der Handlung nach F. Suárez. Eine spätscholastische Kritik an Thomas von Aquins Lehre vom Letztziel des Menschen," *Theologie und Philosophie* 76 (2001) pp. 530-550.

BREUER, A., *Der Gottesbeweis bei Thomas und Suárez*, Fribourg (Suisse) 1929. Cf. ID., *id*., *Divus Thomas* 10 (Freiburg 1932), pp. 105-108.

BRIESKORN, NORBERT, "Lex aeterna. Zu Francisco Suárez.' *Tractatus de legibus ac Deo Legislatore*," in *Die Ordnung der Praxis. Neue Studien zur spanischen Spätscholastik*, ed. Frank Grunert / Kurt Seelmann (Tübingen, 2001), pp. 49-74.

BRINK, B. H., *Francisci Suárez doctrina de causa materali et de materia prima*, Roma 1944.

BRODRICK, J., "Suárez,", *Tablet*, July 16 (1938).

BRUFAU PRATS, JAIME, "Influencia de Suárez en la Ilustración," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 65-80.

BRUNATELLI, H., "Francesco Suárez," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*. 6 (1941), pp. 196-218; 417-432.
BURDI, CH., "Simple note historique sur Durée et Temps chez Suárez," *Archives de. philosophie* 18 (Paris 1949), pp. 33-36.
BURLANDO B., GIANNINA, "Autoconocimiento intelectual en el *De Anima* de Francisco Suárez y *Las Meditaciones sobre Filosofia Primera* de Descartes," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 169-186.
BURLANDO B., GIANNINA, "Configuración psicológica de la libertad humana en F. Suárez", *Teología y vida* 40 (1999), pp. 31-48.
BURLANDO B., GIANNINA, "La arquitectura mental en el Escolasticismo, *Revista de Filosofia*, Chile, vol. 15-16, pp. 99-126.
BURNS, J. PATOUT, S. J., "Action in Suárez," *The New Scholasticism* 37 (1964), pp. 453-472.
CAAMAÑO MARTÍNEZ, JOSÉ, "La mutabilidad del derecho natural en Suárez," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), 61-73.
CABADA CASTRO, H., "Die suarezische Verbegrifflichung des Thomasischen Seins," in A. Grillmeier, *Bonaventura-Thomas von Aquin 1274-197. Theologie und Philosophie* 49 (1974), pp. 324-342.
CABALLERÍA, H., "¿Admite Suárez la cantidad sin extensión actual?" *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 13 (1934), pp. 447-458.
CAFFARENA, J. G.,"El sentido de la composición de ser y esencia en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 15 (1959), pp. 135-254.
CAFFARENA, J. G., "Suárez filósofo," *Razón y Fe* (138-1948), pp. 137-156.
CALAFATE, PEDRO,"A ideia de soberania em Francisco Suárez," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 251-264.
CALVILLO, M., *Francisco Suárez*, Madrid, 1945.
CAMPA, RICARDO, "Il principio politico di Francisco Suárez", in *I trattatisti spagnoli del diritto delle gente*, Madrid-Roma, Union Printing Editori, 96 (1992).
CANTENS, BERNARDO J., "Suárez y Descartes sobre la noción de verdades eternas y su relación con Dios," *Sapientia* 55 (2000), pp. 25-36.
CANTENS, BERNARDO J., "The Relationship Between God and Essences and the Notion of Eternal Truths According to Francisco Suárez," *The Modern Schoolman* 77 (2000), pp. 127-143.
CANTERA, E., *El inmanentismo en la filosofía suarista*, 1919.
CARDOSO, ADELINO, "A identidade real como categoria dinámica no pensamento de F. Suárez", *Análise* 18, 35-50.

CARDOSO, ADELINO, "A viragem glissoniana do pensamento em Francisco Suárez," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 207-222.

CARDOSO, ADELINO, MARTINS, ANTÓNIO MANUEL & RIBEIRO DOS SANTOS, LEONEL (coord.) *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Tradição e modernidade*, Lisboa, 1999 [*Actas & Colóquios*, 21].

CARILLO PRIETO, I., *Cuestiones jurídico-políticos en Francisco Suárez*. Mexico: UNAM 1977.

CARRAUD, VINCENT, *Causa sive ratio. La raison de la cause de Suárez à Leibniz*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France [Epiméthée], 2002.

CARRERAS Y ARTAU, JOAQUÍN, *Doctrinas de Francisco Suárez acerca del Derecho de Gentes y sus relaciones con el Derecho Natural*, Gerona, Tipografia Carreras, 1922.

CARRERAS Y ARTAU, JOAQUÍN, "Notas sobre el texto del tratado *De Anima* de F. Suárez", *Pensamiento* 15 (1959), pp. 293-307.

CARVALHO, JOAQUIM DE, "Pedro de Fonseca, precursor de Suárez na renovação da metafisica", in *Actas del I Congreso Nacional de Filosofía*, Mendoza (Argentina), Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, III (1950), pp. 1921-1926.

CARVALHO, MÁRIO SANTIAGO DE, "Suárez: tempo e duração," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 65-80.

CASE, E.M., *A Critique of the Formative Thought Underlying Francis Suárez's Concept of Being*, Washington, The Catholic University of America Press, Philosophical Studies, 187, 1948.

CASTELLÓ, VIDAL ABRIL., "Francisco Suárez, padre de los derechos humanos," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia*, 7 (1980), pp. 44-52.

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, *Die Anthropologie des Suárez. Beiträge zur spanischen Anthropologie des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*, Freiburg-München, 1962 [2ª edición, Freiburg i. Br. 1982]

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, *La antropología de Suárez*, Valencia, 1963.

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, *La posición de Suárez en la historia*. Valencia 1962.

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "Der Stand der heutigen Suárez-Forschung auf Grund der neu gefundenen Handschriften," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 87 (1980), pp. 134-142.

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "El hombre como persona según Francisco Suárez," *Anales Valentinos* 2 (1976), pp. 179-208.

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "Estudio metafísico-jurídico de las relaciones transcendentales según Francisco Suárez." *Anales Valentinos* 13 (1981), pp. 85-134.

CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "La antropología de Suárez," *Anales del Seminario de Valencia* 6 (1962), pp. 125-346.
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "La Encarnación según Suárez," in *La Encarnación al encuentro de los hombres*, Valencia, Facultad de Teología 'San Vicente Ferrer', 2003, pp. 437-460.
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "La libertad en Francisco Suárez. Dos versiones inéditas sobre la libertad. Estudio comparativo", *Anales Valentinos* 21 (1985), pp. 31-60.
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "La posición de Suárez en la historia," *Anales del Seminario de Valencia* 2 (1962), 5-120.
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "La recepción suareciana del concepto de 'separabilidad' del alma humana", in *Verdad, Percepción, Inmortalidad-Wahrheit, Wahrnehmung, Unsterblichkeit*, Valencia, Facultad de Teología, 1995, pp. 137-149.
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR,"La teoría suareciana de las causas desde el punto de vista del *agathon*," Francisco Suárez, *Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004..
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "Las relaciones humanas en Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 159-170.
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "Posibilidad de la antropología como ciencia, según Francisco Suárez", in *Homenaje a D. Ignacio Valls*, Valencia, Facultad de Teología, 1989, pp. 167-188
CASTELLOTE CUBELLS, SALVADOR, "Teoría epistemológica de Francisco Suárez, a la luz del manuscrito inédito *De Anima*" *Anales Valentinos* 28 (1988), pp. 251-274.
CASULA, M., "Die historische Entwicklung der Frage: ob die Materie denken kann? Von F. Suárez bis B.J.G. Cabanis. Ein Beitrag zur Einführung in die philosophische Problematik der künstlichen Intelligenz." *Filosofia Oggi* 12 (1989), pp. 407-462.
CAYRÉ, F., "François Suárez", *Patrologie* 2 (1933), pp. 773-784.
CEÑAL LLORENTE, RAMÓN, S. J., "Alejandro de Alejandria: Su influjo en la metafísica de Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948), pp. 91-122.
CEÑAL LLORENTE, RAMÓN, S. J.,"Los fundamentos metafísicos de la moral según Suárez," *Revista de Filosofia* 7 (1948), pp. 721-735; repr. in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofia, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), 15-128.
CEÑAL LLORENTE, RAMÓN, S. J., "Pedro de Fonseca (1528-1599). Su crítica del Texto de la 'Metaphysica' de Aristoteles," *Revista de Filosofia* 2, 4 (1943), pp. 124-146.
CERECEDA, F., "Formas renacientes en la producción científica suareciana," Razón y fé 138 (1948), pp. 111-137.

CERQUEIRA GONÇALVES, JOAQUIM, "Francisco Suárez e a modernidade filosófica—a distinção essência-existência," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 121-132.

CLARKE, WILLIAM, N., "The Notion of Human Liberty in Suárez," *The Modern Schoolman* 19 (1942), pp. 32-35.

CONILL, JESUS,"Suárez desde Ortega y Zubiri; La insistencia metafísica *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

CONZE, EBERHARD, *Der Begriff der Metaphysik bei Suárez. Gegenstandsbereich und Primat der Metaphysik*, Leipzig,F. Meiner, 1928.

CORDEIRO, V. A., *O Padre Suárez, Doutor Exímio, Esboço da sua vida e obras*, Porto, 1918.

CORSANO, A., *Le origini della Filosofia analitica. Suárez, Leibniz, Kant, Herbart, Frege*, Bari, Adriatica, 1962.

CORTINA, ADELA,"Los fundamentos relacionales del orden político en Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

COUJOU, JEAN-PAUL, *Le vocabulaire de Suárez*, Paris, Ellipses, 2001.

COUJOU, JEAN-PAUL, *Suárez et la refondation de la métaphysique comme ontologie. Etude et traduction de l'Index détaillé de la Métaphysique d'Aristote de Francisco Suárez,* Louvain-la-Neuve/Paris, Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie/Peeters, 1999.

COUJOU, JEAN-PAUL,"La formulation de la question de la loi naturelle chez Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

COUJOU, JEAN-PAUL, "Suárez et la Renaissance de la métaphysique", in *Francis Suárez, Disputes métaphysiques I, II, III*, texte intégral présenté et traduit par Jean-Paul Coujou, Paris, Vrin [Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques], 1998, 7-45.

COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, *Nature et empire de la loi. Etudes suaréziennes*, Paris, Vrin-EHESS. 1999.

COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990, "Épiméthée."

COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Différence ontologique et analogie de l'être. Le tournant suarézien," *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie*, 1989, n°2, pp. 41-76.

COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Direito natural e direito das gentes. A refundação moderna, de Vitoria a Suárez," *A descoberta do homem e do*

mundo, Organização Adauto Novaes, Minc-Funarte. São Paulo, Companhia das Letras, 1998, pp.293-333.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "La problématique suarézienne de l'individuation. Tradition et modernité", in: G. Boehme & E. Rudolph (éds.): *Individuum, Probleme der Individualität in Kunst, Philosophie und Wissenschaft*. Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 1994, pp.48-67.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "La raison et l'empire de la loi," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 289-310.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Le principe d'individuation chez Suárez et chez Leibniz," *Studia leibnitiana*, Suppl. 23, (1983), pp.174-190.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Le projet suarézien de la métaphysique," *Les Archives de Philosophie* 42 (1979), pp. 235-273.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Le statut ontologique du possible selon Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 247-268.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "L'héritage suarézien dans la philosophie politique classique," in: F. Chatelet *et al.* (éds.): *Dictionnaire des oeuvres politiques*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1989 [2e éd.], pp.1017-1024.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Nominalisme et pensée classique, la situation exemplaire de Suárez," *Recherches sur le XVIIème siècle*, 1976 (I), pp.21-34.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Ontologie ou métaphysique?" *Giornale di metafisica*, 7 (1985), pp. 3-24.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Suárez et la tradition aristotélicienne de la métaphysique," *Aristotelismus und Renaissance, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen*, 1988 (Bd.40), pp.101-126.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Théologie morale et conception du politique chez Suárez," in: Luce Giard—Louis de Vaucelles (éds.): *Les Jésuites à l'âge baroque* (1540-1640). Grenoble, Jérôme Millon, 1996, pp. 261-278.
COURTINE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, "Vitoria, Suárez et la naissance du droit naturel moderne," in *Histoire de la philosophie politique*, II, *Naissances de la modernité*, ed. Alain Renaut, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1999, 127-181.
COURTNEY, F., "Francis Suárez, 1548-1617," *Clergy Review* 30 (1948), pp. 361-371.
COXITO, AMÂNDIO A., "Francisco Suárez: as relações entre a Igreja e o Estado," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 239-250.
CRAIG, W. L., *Future Contingents and Divine Foreknowledge from Aristotle to Suárez*. Leyden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1988.

CRONIN, TIMOTHY J., *Objective Being in Descartes and Suárez*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987. First published as *Analecta Gregoriana* 154, Rome, 1966.

CRONIN, TIMOTHY J., "Eternal Truths in the Thought of Suárez and Descartes," *The Modern Schoolman* 38 (1960-1961), pp. 269-288; 39, pp. 23-38.

CRONIN, TIMOTHY J.,"Objective Reality of Ideas in Human Thought: Descartes and Suárez," in *Wisdom in Depth. Essays in Honor of Henri Renard, S. J.* eds. V. F. Daues, S. J., M. R. Holloway, S. J., LSweeney, S. J. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1966, pp. 68-79.

CRUZ HERNÁNDEZ, MIGUEL, "La intencionalidad en la filosofía de Francisco Suárez," *Revista de Filosofia* 7 (Madrid 1948), pp. 767-791. Cf. ID., id. *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofia de Barcelona* 1948 I (Madrid 1949), pp. 315-337.

CRUZ HERNÁNDEZ, MIGUEL, "Suárez y el tránsito de la Escolástica a la filosofía moderna", *Boletín de la Universidad de Granada* 19 (1947), pp. 263-291.

DALMAU, JOSÉ MARÍA, "El principio de identidad comparada según Suárez," *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 5 (1926), pp. 91-98.

DALMAU, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Metafisica y teología en Suárez," *Estudios eclesiasticos* 22 (1948), pp. 549-569.

DALMAU, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Suárez," *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 11. Città del Vaticano 1953, pp. 1452-1458.

DALMAU, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Suárez teólogo." *Razón y fe* 138 (1948), pp 157-186.

DALMAU, JOSÉ MARÍA, "Suárez y las grandes controversias sobre la gracia," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943).

DANIEL, STEPHEN H., "Berkeley, Suárez, and the *Esse-Existere* Distinction," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 74 (2000), pp. 621-636.

DARGE, ROLF, *Suárez transzendentale Seinsauslegung und die Metaphysiktradition*. Leiden-Boston: Brill 2004. (*Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters*, 80), 2004.

DARGE, ROLF, "Die Grundlegung einer algemeinen Theorie der transzendentalen Eigenschaften des Seienden bei F. Suárez," *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 54 (2000), ppp. 339-358.

DARGE, ROLF, "Eines oder Vieles. Zu einem Grundproblem der scholastichen Theorien über das Eine," *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 57 (2003), pp. 27-52.

DARGE, ROLF, "*Ens in quantum ens*: Die Erklärung des Subjekts der Metaphysik bei F. Suárez," *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 66-2 (1999), pp. 335-361.

DARGE, ROLF, "*Ens intime transcendit omnia*: Suárez Modell der transzendentalen Analyse und die mittelalterlichen Transzendentalienlehren," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 47 (2000), pp. 150-172.

DARGE, ROLF, "Grundthese und ontologische Bedeutung der Lehre von der Analogie des Seienden nach F. Suárez," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 106-2 (1999), pp. 312-333.
DARGE, ROLF, "Seinswahrheit und Erkenntniswahrheit. Francisco Suárez und die thomistische Lehre von der analogia veri", in: M. Pickhave (ed.), *Die Logik des Transzendentalen. Festschrift für Jan A. Aertsen zum 65. Geburtstag*, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 30, Berlin-New York 2003.
DARGE, ROLF, "Suárez' Analyse der Transzendentalien 'Ding' und 'Etwas' im Kontext der scholastischen Metaphysiktradition," *Theologie und Philosophie* 75 (2000) pp. 339-358.
DARGE, ROLF, "Suárez Begriff der transzendentalen Einheit," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 43 (2001), pp. 37-57.
DARGE, ROLF, "Suárez Theorie der ontischen Wahrheit und die Metaphysiktradition," *Theologie und Philosophie* 79 (2004) pp. 31-54.
DARGE, ROLF, "Suárez, Francisco," *Metzler Lexikon christlicher Denker.* M. Vinzent. Stuttgart: Metzler 2000, pp. 657-658.

DARGE, ROLF, "Vom Gutsein der Dinge. Suárez' Theorie des ontischen Guten und die Metaphysiktradition," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.
DE LA SIENRA, ADOLFO GARCÍA, "El libre albedrío y la gracia: Molina, Suárez y la reforma," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 265-278.
DE VRIES, JAKOB, "Die Erkenntnislehre des Franz Suárez und der Nominalismus," *Scholastik* 3 (1949), pp. 321-344.
DEL CURA, A., "Las disputaciones metafísicas de Suárez," *Estudios Filosoficos* 9 (Santander 1960), pp. 351-358.
DEGL'INNOCENTI, V., "Suárez pro Capreolo in quaestione de persona," *Euntes docete* (Roma), 6 (1953), pp. 391-393.
DELGADO, MARIANO, "Die Zustimmung des Volkes in der politischen Theorie von Francisco de Vitoria, Bartolomé de Las Casas und Francisco Suárez," in *Die Ordnung der Praxis. Neue Studien zur spanischen Spätscholastik*, ed. Frank Grunert / Kurt Seelmann (Tübingen, 2001), pp. 157-183.
DELL'ORO, MAIM, A., "Influencia de Suárez en América," *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* I (Madrid 1949), pp. 187-194.
DESCOQS, PEDRO, S. J., *Eléments d'ontologie*, Paris 1925.
DESCOQS, PEDRO, S. J., *Praelectiones theologiae naturalis*. Paris 1935.
DESCOQS, PEDRO, S. J., "Le Suarézisme," *Archives de Philosophie* 2 (1924), pp. 123-154; 187-219.
DESCOQS, PEDRO, S. J., "Questions de métaphysique: le Suarézisme," *Archives de philosophie* 2 (1924), pp. 123-154.

DESCOQS, PEDRO, S. J., "Thomisme et Suarézisme," *Archives de philosophie* 4–4 (1927), pp. 82-192.
DEURINGER, K., *Die Lehre vom Glauben beim jungen Suárez*, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1941.
DOERIG, J.A., "Suárez y Rousseau como precursores espirituales de la independencia hispanoamericana," *Folia humanística* 6 (Barcelona 1968) 343-353.
DOIG, JAMES C., "Suárez, Descartes, and the Objective Reality of Ideas," *The New Scholasticism* 51 (1977), pp. 350-371.
DOMÍNGUEZ, D., "¿Es censurable el eclecticismo filosófico suareziano?" *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 8 (1929), pp. 471-486, y 9 (1930), pp. 213-238.
DONAT, "Comentario a Franz Suárez. Gedenkblätter..," *Zeitschrift fur katholische Theologie* 42 (1918), pp. 423-427,
DOYLE, JOHN P., "'Extrinsic Cognoscibility': A Seventeenth Century Super-Transcendental Notion," *The Modern Schoolman* 68 (1990), pp. 57-80.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Francisco Suárez on The Law of Nations," in *Religion and International Law*, edd. Mark W. Janis, Carolyn Evans, London, 1999, pp. 103-120.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Francisco Suárez: On Preaching the Gospel to People like American Indians," *Fordham International Law Journal* 15/4 (1992), pp. 879-951.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Francisco Suárez, S.J. on Human Rights," in *Menschenrechte: Rechte und Pflichten in Ost und West. Strukturen der Macht: Studien zum politischen Denken Chinas*, Band 9, herausgegeben von Konrad Wegmann, Wolfgang Ommerborn & Heiner Roetz, Muenster/Hamburg/Berlin/London: LIT Verlag 2001, pp. 105-132.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Heidegger and Scholastic Metaphysics," *The Modern Schoolman* 49 (1971-1972), pp. 98-103, 201-220.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Prolegomena to a Study of Extrinsic Denomination in the Work of Francis Suárez, S. J.," *Vivarium* 22 (1984), pp. 119-160.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez, Francisco," *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* London/New York: Routledge, 1998, vol. 9, pp. 189-196.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez on Beings of Reason and Truth I," *Vivarium* 25 (1987), pp. 47-76.; 26 (1988), pp. 51-72.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez on the Analogy of Being," *The Modern Schoolman* 46 (1968-1969), pp. 219-249, 323-341.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez on the Reality of the Possibles," *The Modern Schoolman* 45 (1967-1968), pp. 29-48.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez on Truth and Mind-Dependent Beings: Implications for a Unified Semiotic," In *Semiotics 1983*. Jonathan Evans & John Deely (eds). New York: The University Press of America 1987, pp. 121-133.

DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez on the Truth of the Proposition, 'This is My Body,'" *The Modern Schoolman*, 77 (January 2000), pp. 145-163.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "Suárez on the Unity of a Scientific Habit," *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65-3 (1991), pp 311-334.
DOYLE, JOHN P., "The Suarezian Proof for God's Existence," in THRO, L J. (ed.), *A History of Philosophy in the Making: A Symposium of Essays in Honor oof Professor James D. Collins on His 65th Birthday*, Washington, D.C. 1982, pp. 105-117.
DROUIN, P.-E., "L'entitatif et l'intentionnel. Etude comparée de la doctrine thomiste et de l'enseignement suarézien," *Laval théologique et philosophique* 6 (1950), pp. 293-311.
DUMONT, PAUL, *Liberté humaine et concours divin d'après Suárez*, Paris, 1936.
DURÃO ALVES, P., *A Filosofia política de Suárez*, Porto, 1945.
DURÃO ALVES, P., "O Doutor Exímio. Caracter fundamental da sua obra," *Centenario de Suárez* (Barcelona 1949), pp. 103-120.
DUTTON, B., "Suarezian Foundations of Descartes' Ontological Argument," *The Modern Schoolman* 70 (1993), pp. 245-258.
ELÍAS DE TEJADA, FRANCISCO, "Suárez y el pensamiento inglés contemporáneo," in *Homenaje al Dr. Exímio P. Suárez, S.J. en el IV centenario de su nacimiento* (*Acta Salmanticensia. Derecho*, I-2, 1948), pp. 27-43.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., *El plan de Dios en S. Agustín y Suárez*. Madrid, 1969.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., *Teoría de Suárez sobre la justicia de Dios*, Granada: Cátedra de Francisco Suárez, 1942.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Cartas y manuscritos de Suárez. Introducción. Ciclos del pensamiento suareciano," *Miscelánea Comillas* 38 (1962), pp. 271-330.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Datos para el proceso de beatificación del P. F. Suárez," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 33 (1970), pp. 5-78.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Dedicatorias y Proemios de las obras de Suárez," *Miscelanea Comillas* 9 (1948).
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Dos problemas morales en Cano y Suárez," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 36 (1961), pp. 21-33.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Duns Scoti influxus in Francisci Suárez doctrinam," *Acta Congressus Scotistici Internationalis Oxonii et Edimburgi. De doctrina Joannis Duns Scoti*, *Studia Scholastico-Scotistica* 4 (1968), Rome, pp. 307-337.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "El acción de resultancia en Suárez," *Anales de la Cátedra Francisco Suárez* 3 (1963). Pp. 45-71.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "El archivo suareciano de la Universidad de Deusto," *Estudioos Eclesiásticos* 56 (1981), pp. 285-300.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "El concepto objetivo en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948), *nümero extraordinario*, pp. 335-423.

ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "El humanismo suareciano," *Razón y Fe* 138 (1948), pp. 35-64.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "El teocentrismo en las obras jurídicas de Suárez," *Archivo teológico granadino* 5 (1942), pp. 95-131.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Estado actual de los estudios suarecianos," in P. L. MUGICA, *Bibliografia suareciana*, Granada 1948, pp. 5-39.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Filosofia cristiana de San Agustín y Suárez," *Augustinus* 14 (1969), pp. 3-42.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Influjo de Fonseca en Suárez," *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 11 (1955), pp. 507-519.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La acción de resultancia en Suárez," *Anales de la Cátedra 'Francisco Suárez,'"* (Granada) 3 (1963), pp. 45-71.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La igualdad jurídica según Suárez," in *Homenaje al Dr. Exímio P. Suárez, S.J. en el IV centenario de su nacimiento* (*Acta salmanticensia. Derecho*, I-2, 1948), pp. 101-132.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La moral suareciana," *Anuario de la Asociación Francisco de Victoria* 6 (1943-1945), pp. 97-189.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La potencia obediencial en Suárez," *Las ciencias* 9 (1944), pp. 815-833.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La predestinación en los santos en San Agustín y Suárez," *Augustinus* 15 (1970), pp. 233-262.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La predestinación en Suárez. Controversias con Vázquez, Salas y Lesio," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 10 (1947), pp. 7-151.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "La teología mística de Suárez," *Manresa* 15-16 (1943-1944), pp. 117-129; 203-230, 220-240.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Las leyes de la palabra y sus aplicaciones exegéticas según Suárez," *Miscellanea Comillas* 41 (1964), pp. 259-292.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Las perfecciones relativas de la Trinidad en la doctrina suareciana," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 7 (1944), pp. 187-219.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Metafísica del ser bueno en Suárez," *Arbor* 66 (1967), pp. 99-101.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Padre Francisco Suárez S. J. Su vida y su obra (1548-1617)," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943), pp. 7-28.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Realidades axiológicas en Rintelen y en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 17 (1961), pp. 348-358.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "San Agustín y Suárez, heraldos de la unidad," *Augustinus* 14 (1969), pp. 267-294; 15 (1970), pp. 233-262.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "San Agustín y Suárez," *Augustinus* 13 (1968), pp. 167-212.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "San Agustín y Suárez. Conclusiones y nuevas perspectivas" *Augustinus* 16 (1971), pp. 113-122.

ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "San Agustín y Suárez. El Doctor de la gracia," *Augustinus* 16 (1971), pp. 13-45.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Suárez," *Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirche*, Freiburg, 1964. IX, col. 1129-1132.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Suárez en la historia de la moral," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de filosofía* 7 (1980), pp. 133-147.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Suárez en las controversias sobre la gracia," *Archivo Teológico Granadino,* 11 (1948), pp. 117-192.
ELORDUY, ELEUTERIO, S. J., "Teoría de Suárez sobre la justicia de Dios," *Boletin de la Universidad de Granada* 14 (1942), pp. 21-64, 209-234.
ENES, JOSÉ, "Suárez e o regresso ao momento ontológico de Parménides no dealbar da Modernidade," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 21-36.
ERNST, WILHELM, *Die Tugendlehre des Franz Suárez, mit einer Edition seiner römischen Vorlesung 'De habitibus in communi,'* Leipzig, 1964.
ESCHWEILER, K., "Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten," *Spanische Forschung des Górres-Gesellschaft. Erste Reihe* 1 (1928), pp. 251-326.
ESCHWEILER, K., "Zur Geschichte der Barokscholastik," *Theologische Revue* 27-28 (1928-9), pp. 337-430. (Revue of Conze, *Der Begriff der Metaphysik*.).
ESPOSITO, COSTANTINO, "Das Seiende und das Gute. Francisco Suárez zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Martin Heidegger", in *Vom Rätsel des Begriffs. Festschrift F.-W. von Herrmann*, ed. P.-L. Coriando, Berlin, Duncker & Humboldt, 1999, pp. 341-356.
ESPOSITO, COSTANTINO, "Heidegger, Suárez e la storia dell'ontologia," in *Heidegger e i medievali*, ed. Costantino Esposito / Pasquale Porro, Turnhout-Bari, Brepols [*Quaestio. Annuario di Storia della metafisica*, 1], 2001, pp. 407-430.
ESPOSITO, COSTANTINO, "L'ente, l'essenza, il bene. Suárez e Heidegger," *Annali chieresi*, 1998, pp. 61-76.
ESPOSITO, COSTANTINO, "Ritorno a Suárez. Le *Disputationes metaphysicae* nella critica contemporanea," in *La Filosofia nel Siglo de Oro. Studi sul tardo Rinascimento spagnolo*, ed. Ada Lamacchia, Bari, Levante, 1995, pp. 465-573.
ESPOSITO, COSTANTINO, "The Concept of Time in the Metaphysics of Suárez," in *The Medieval Concept of Time. The Scholastic Debate and Its Reception in Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Pasquale Porro (Leiden, Brill, 2001), pp. 383-398.
ESTEBAN ROMERO, ANDRÉS AVELINO, *La concepción suareciana de la ley. Estudio teologico-critico*, Sevilla, 1944.

FABRO, CORNELIO, "Neotomismo e neosuarezismo; una bataglia di principi," *Divus Thomas* 44 (Piacenza 1941), pp. 167-215 y 420-498.
FABRO, CORNELIO, "Una fonte antitomista della metafisica suareziana," *Divus Thomas* 50 (Piacenza 1947), pp. 57-68.
FARELL, W., *The Natural Moral Law according to St. Thomas and Suárez*, Ditchling, 1930.
FASTIGGI, ROBERT, "The Proof for the Existence of God in Suárez," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 81-92.
FERNÁNDEZ, CLEMENTE, *Metafísica del conocimiento en Suárez*, Madrid, 1954. (*Estudios Onienses* III 4).
FERNANDEZ, CLEMENTE, S. J.," Metafísica del conocimiento en Suárez," *Estudios Onienses*, serie III, vol. IV, Madrid, 1954.
FERNÁNDEZ ALMUZARA, E., "El Padre Francisco Suárez en Coimbra." in *Miscelanea Comillas* 9 (1948), pp. 247-259.
FERNÁNDEZ BURILLO, SANTIAGO, *La génesis de la metafísica en Francisco Suárez*, Granada, 1988.
FERNÁNDEZ BURILLO, SANTIAGO, "Francisco Suárez, teólogo y filósofo del humanismo renacentista. Una metafísica del ser como accion," in *Espíritu* 42 (1993), pp. 45-54.
FERNÁNDEZ BURILLO, SANTIAGO, "Introducción a la teoría del conocimiento de Francisco Suárez," *Pensamiento* 48 (1992), pp. 211-230.
FERNÁNDEZ BURILLO, SANTIAGO, "Las 'Disputaciones Metafísicas' de Francisco Suárez, S. J., su inspiración y algunas de sus líneas maestras. En el IV centenario de la primera edición (1597-1997)," *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* 4 (1997), pp. 65-86.
FERNÁNDEZ BURILLO, SANTIAGO, "Metafísica de la creación en Francisco Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 25 (1998), pp. 5-55.
FERNÁNDEZ BURILLO, SANTIAGO, "Suárez y el ontologismo," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 20 (1993), pp. 213-243.
FERNÁNDEZ CASTAÑEDA, JAIME, "Right Reason in Francisco Suárez," *The Modern Schoolman* 45 (1967-1968), pp. 105-122.
FERNÁNDEZ DE VIANA, F., "Estudios sobre la metafisica de Francisco Suárez," *Angelicum* 27 (1950), pp. 285-302.
FERNÁNDEZ DE VIANA, F., "Problemas actuales en el umbral de la Metafísica," *Estudios Filosoficos*, 5 (1956), pp. 459-510; 6 (1957), 5-51.
FERRATER MORA, JOSÉ, *Suárez y la filosofía moderna. Cuestiones disputadas*, Madrid, 1955.
FERRATER MORA, JOSÉ, "Suárez," *Diccionario de Filosofía*. Buenos Aires, 1965.
FERRATER MORA, JOSÉ, "Suárez and Modern Philosophy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14 (1953), pp. 528-547.

FERRATER MORA,,JOSÉ, "Suárez et la philosophie moderne," *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 68 (1963).

FERRATER MORA, JOSÉ, "Suárez y la filosofía moderna," *Notas y Estudios de Filosofía*.Tucumán, (Argentina) 2 (1951), pp. 269-294.

FERREIRA GOMES, J., "A Imutabilidade moral de Deus em Francisco Suárez, 1548-1617, e em Cristóvão Gil, 1555-1608," *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofía* (1960), pp. 437-453.

FERRO COUSELO, MANUEL, "Los juicios sintéticos 'a priori' en Suárez y Kant," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, I (1949), pp. 363-377.

FICHTER, J., *Man of Spain. A Biography of Francis Suárez*, New York City 1940.

FIORITO, M. A., "El pensamiento filosófico del suarismo y del tomismo," *Presencia y sugestión del filósofo F. Suárez*. Buenos Aires 1959, pp 363-377.

FLECKENSTEIN, J. OTTO, "Der Aristotelismus von Suárez und der Funktionalismus in der Wissenschaft des Leibniz," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, II (1949), pp. 317-325 [Trad. española, en: *Revista de Filosofia* 7 (1948), pp. 747-754].

FOISNEAU, LUC, "L'autorité de la scolastique: enjeux politiques de la critique du libre-arbitre (Hobbes, Bramhall, Suárez)," in *Aspects de la pensée médiévale dans la philosophie politique moderne*, ed. Yves Charles Zarka, Paris: PUF, 1999, pp. 167-190.

FORLIVESI, MARCO (trans. O. BOULNOS), "La distinction entre concept formel et concept objectif. Suárez, Pasqualijo, Mastri." *Les études philosophiques*, 1 (2002), pp. 3-30.

FORLIVESI, MARCO," Ontologia impura. La natura della metafisica secondo Francisco Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

FORTEZA, BARTOMEU, "La influencia de Francisco Suárez sobre Thomas Hobbes," *Convivium. Revista de filosofía*, 11 (1998), pp. 40-79.

FOSSATI, L.," Conoscenza e volontà el Suárez," *Rivista di Filosofia* 21 (1930), pp. 29-57.

FUERES HERREROS, J. L., "Presencia y límite de F. Suárez en el 'Pharus Scientiarum' (1659) de S. Izquierdo," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía*, 8 (1981), pp. 173-189.

FUETSCHER, LORENZ, S. J., *Akt und Potenz: eine kritisch-systematische Auseinandersetzung mit dem neueren Thomismus*. Insbruck: F. Rauch, 1933.

FURLONG, GUILLERMO, "Francisco Suárez, el filósofo de la revolución argentina de 1810," *Presencia y singularidad del filósofo F. Suárez* (Buenos Aires 1959), pp. 75-112.

GALLEGO SALVADORES, JORDAN, "La aparición de las primeras metafísicas sistemáticas en la España del XVI: Diego Más (1587), Francisco Suárez y Diego de Zuñiga (1597)," *Escritos del Vedat* 3 (1973), pp. 91-162.

GALLEGOS ROCAFULL, J. M., *La doctrina política del Padre Francisco Suárez*. Mexico: Jus, 1948.

GARCÍA, CLAUDIA, "Descartes y Suárez: sobre la falsedad non judicativa," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 187-206.

GARCÍA CUADRADO, JOSÉ A., "La renovación de la metafísica en el siglo de Oro: Suárez y Báñez (En el cuarto centenario de las Disputaciones metafísicas de Francisco Suárez)," *Analogía Filosófica* 13 (1999), pp. 59-78.

GARCIA DE LA MORA, J. M.," Francisco Suárez: interpretaciones y críticas," *Convivium*, 20 ser:, n. 1996.

GARCIA LÓPEZ, JESÚS, "La concepción suarista del ente y sus implicaciones metafísicas," *Anuario filosófico* 2 (Pamplona 1969), pp. 137-167.

GARCIA MARTINEZ, FIDEL,"Algunos principios diferenciales de la metafísica suareciana frente al tomismo tradicional," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948, *número extraordinario*), pp. 11-30.

GARCIA MARTINEZ, FIDEL, "El sentido de la realidad en la metafísica suareciana," *Miscellanea Comillas* 9 (1948), pp. 309-322.

GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, FIDEL, "El sentido de la realidad metafísica suareciana," in *Homenaje al Doctor Exímio Padre Suárez, S.J. en el IV centenario de su nacimiento* (*Acta Salmanticensia. Derecho*, I-2, 1948), pp. 133-146.

GARCIA Y GARCIA, ANTONIO, "El derecho canonico en Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 149-158.

GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, Reginald, O. P., "Les difficultés que laissent subsister les conceptions scotiste et suarésienne des noms divins," GARRIGOU-LAGRANCE, Reginald, *Dieu, son existence et sa nature*, 3 éd. Paris 1920, pp. 568-588.

GARZON VALDÉS, ERNESTO, "Die Wörter des Gesetzes und ihre Auslegung. Einige Thesen von Francisco Suárez," in *Die Ordnung der Praxis. Neue Studien zur spanischen Spätscholastik*, ed. Frank Grunert / Kurt Seelmann (Tübingen, 2001), pp. 109-122.

GEMELLI, A. (ed.), "Scritti Vari Pubblicati in occasione del terzo centenario della morte di Suárez," *Revista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 10 (1918), pp. 1-151. (With contributions of G. Bernareggi, Monaco, Masnovo, Ugarte de Ercilla, Semeria, Tragella, Ritter.)

GEMMEKE, ELISABETH, "Die Metaphysik des sittlich Guten bei Franz Suárez," *Freiburger Theologische Studien* 84 (1965).
GESSNER, J., *Suárez*, Brescia, 1945.
GIACON, CARLO, S. J., *La Seconda Scolastica.. Precedenze teoretiche ai problemi giuridici: Toledo, Pereira, Fonseca, Molina, Suárez*. Milano 1947.
GIACON, CARLO, S. J., *La seconda scolastica*, vol. III, *I problemi giuridici-politici. Suárez, Bellarmino, Mariana*, Milano, Fratelli Bocca, 1950.
GIACON, CARLO, S. J., *Suárez*, Brescia, La Scuola, 1945.
GIACON, CARLO, S. J., "Suárez," *Enciclopedia filosófica*, Florence 2 (1967), VI, col. 248-250.
GIANTURCO, E., "Suárez and Vico," *The Harvard Theological Review* 27 (1934), pp. 207-210.
GIERS, J., *Die Gerechtigkeitslehre des jungen Suárez. Edition und Untersuchung seiner römischen Vorlesungen De iustitia et iure*, Freiburg 1958.
GIL COLOMER, R., "El tratado "De Anima" de Suárez. Observaciones histórico críticas," *Convivium* 17-18 (Barcelona 1964), pp. 127-141.
GILSON, ÉTIENNE, *Being and Some Philosophers*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1952.
GILSON, ÉTIENNE, *L'être et l'essence*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1948.
GNEMMI, A., *Il fondamento metafisico. Analisi di struttura sulle "Disputationes Metaphysicae" di F. Suárez*. Milano: Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore. Serie Filosofica 4. 1969.
GNEMMI, A., "Fondamento metafisico e mediazione trascendentale nelle "Disputationes Metaphysicae" di Suárez," *Rivista Filosofica Neo-Scolastica*, 58 (1966), pp. 1-24; 175-188.
GNEMMI, A., "Nuova postilla a proposito di fondamento metafisico di F. Suárez." *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 67 (1975), pp. 622-624.
GNEMMI, A., "Postilla. A proposito di fondamento metafisico di F. Suárez," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 65 (1973), pp. 410-417.
GOMES, FERREIRA J., "A imutabilitade moral de Deus em Francisco Suárez e em Cristovão Gil," *Revista portuguesa de Filosofia* 16 (1960), pp. 437-458.
GÓMEZ, L. M., "Lo existencial en la analogía del ser según Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1949, número extraordinario) pp. 215-243.
GÓMEZ, MARIANO ALVAREZ, "Sobre el concepto de individuo en F. Suárez," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 45-64.
GÓMEZ ARBOLEYA, ENRIQUE, *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Situación espiritual, vida y obras, metafísica*. Granada, Publicaciones de la catédra Francisco Suárez, Universidad de Granada, 2 vol., 1946.
GÓMEZ ARBOLEYA, ENRIQUE, "Dios y la creación en la metafísica de Francisco Suárez," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco*

Suárez y Jaime Balmes, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, II (1949), pp. 479-515.
GÓMEZ ARBOLEYA, ENRIQUE, "La antropología de Francisco Suárez y su filosofía juridical," *Anuario de la Asociación Francisco Vitoria* 6 (1934-35), pp. 29-95.
GÓMEZ ARBOLEYA, ENRIQUE, "Suárez y el mundo moderno," *Revista nacional de educación* 3 (1943), pp. 167-194.
GÓMEZ CAFFARENA, J., "El sentido de la composición de ser y esencia en Suárez," *Pensamiento*, 15 (1959), pp. 135-154.
GÓMEZ CAFFARENA, J., "Suárez filósofo," *Razon y Fé, número extraordinario*, 1948, pp. 137-157.
GONZÁLEZ ÁLVAREZ, A., "Dos libros sobre Suárez," *Arbor* 8 (1947), pp. 267-272.
GONZALEZ TORRES, J., *El concepto de potencia y sus diversas acepciones en Suárez*. Quito 1957.
GOUDRIAAN, ASA, *Philosophische Gotteserkentnnis bei Suárez und Descartes in Zusammenhang mit der niederlândischen reformierten Theologie und Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Leiden/Boston/ Kôln: Brill, 1999.
GRABMANN, MARTIN, "Die *Disputationes Metaphysicae* des Franz Suárez in ihrer methodischen Eigenart und Fortwirkung," *Mittekakterkuches Geustesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*. München, 1926, pp. 525-560.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E. & DAVIS, DOUGLAS, *The Metaphysics of Good and Evil According to Suárez*. Munich & Vienna: Philosophia Verlag, 1989.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Evil and the Transcendentality of Goodness: Suárez's Solution to the Problem of Positive Evils," in Scott MACDONALD (ed.), *Being and Goodness: The Concept of the Good in Metaphysics and Philosophical Theology*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1991, pp. 151-178.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Francisco Suárez," in *A Companion to Epistemology*, E. SOSA & J. DANCY, eds. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), pp. 494-495.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Francisco Suárez," in H. BURKHARD & E. SMITH, *Handbook of Metaphysics and Ontology* (Munich, Philadelphia, and Vienna: Philosophia Verlag, 1991), pp. 867-870.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Francisco Suárez," in *Individuation in Scholasticism: The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation 1150-1650*. Munich & Vienna: Philosophia Verlag, 1992. Also published by State University of New York Press, Albany, 1994.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Francisco Suárez: The Man in History," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65, 3 (1991), pp. 259-266.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "La concepción de Suárez sobre la metafísica," in JORGE J. E. GRACIA, ed. *Concepciones de la metafísica*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998, pp. 101-124.

GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez," in *A Companion to Metaphysics*, ed. Jae Won Kim & E. Sosa (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), pp. 479-480.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E. (ed.), "Suárez," in *Concepciones de la metafísica*. Madrid: Editorial Trotta-CSIC, vol. 17, pp. 101-124.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez (and Later Scholasticism)," in *The Routledge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. J. Marenbon (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 452-474.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez and the Transcendentals," *Topoi* 11 (1992), pp. 11-23.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez y la individualidad," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía*, 10 (1983), pp. 157-182. Trans. I. Jaksic.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez, Francisco," *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, ed. R. AUDI (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 772-773.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez," with E. Millán, in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted Honderich (Oxford: Oxford University), p. 856..
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez and Metaphysical Mentalism: the Last Visit," *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67-3 (1993), pp. 349-354.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez's Conception of Metaphysics: A Step in the Direction of Mentalism?" *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65-3 (1991), pp. 287-310.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez's Criticism of the Thomistic Principle of Individuation," *Atti del Congresso di S. Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo VII Centenario* (Rome: 1977), pp. 563-568.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "Suárez's Metaphysical Disputations: From the Middle Ages to Modernity," in Jorge Gracia et al (eds.), *The Classics of Western Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 204-209.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "The Language of Categories: From Aristotle to Ryle, via Suárez and Kant," in *L'elaboration du vocabulaire philosophique au Moyen Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 337-355.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "The Ontological Status of the Transcendental Attributes of Being in Scholasticism and Modernity: Suárez and Kant," in *Was ist philosophie im Mittelalter*, edd. Jan A. Aertsen, Andreas Speer, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter [*Miscellanea Medievalia*, 26], 1998, pp. 213-225.
GRACIA, JORGE J. E., "What the Individual adds to the Common Nature according to Suárez," *The New Scholasticism*, 53 (1979), pp. 221-233.
GRUA, GASTON, *Jurisprudence universelle et théodicée selon Leibniz*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1953.
GUANDIQUE, JOSÉ SALVADO, "Noción de ley. Doctrina de Francisco Suárez," in *Actas del I Congreso Nacional de Filosofía*, Mendoza (Argentina), Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, II (1950), pp. 1923-1926.

GUELL, O. W., "Actualidad de Suárez en la Filosofia," *Presencia y singularidad del filósofo F. Suárez*. Buenos Aires 1959, pp. 113-124.
GUERRERO, E., "¿Afirma alguna vez el Padre Suárez que los primeros principios son inductivos?" *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 12 (1933), pp. 5-32.
GUERRERO, E., "El 'François Suárez' de Leon Mahieu," *Razón y Fe* 138 (1948), pp. 313-353.
GUERRERO, RAFAEL RAMÓN, "Estudios y referencias árabes en profesores complutenses: Suárez y Avicena," in *La Universidad Complutense Cisneriana. Impulso filosófico, científico y literario. Siglos XVI y XVII*, ed. Luis Jiménez Moreno, Madrid, Editorial Complutense, 1996, pp. 207-225.
GUMMERSBACH, J., *Unsündlichkeit und Befestigung in der Gnade nach der Lehre der Scholastik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Suárez. Ein Beitrag zur spekulativen Theologie und ihrer Geschichte*, Frankfurt 1933.
GUTHRIE, HUNTER, S. J., "La significación histórica de Francisco Suárez," *Estudios* 70 (Buenos Aires 1947), pp. 401-425.
GUTHRIE, HUNTER, S. J., "The Metaphysical Thought of Francis Suárez," *Thought* (Fordham University Quarterly) 16 (1941), pp. 297-311.
GUY, ALAIN, "L'analogie de l'être selon Suárez," *Archives de Philosophie* 42 (1979), pp. 275-294.
GUY, ALAIN, "Suárez y nosotros," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 321-326.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., *Cosmologia*, en la colección *Philosophiae Scholasticae Summa*, t. 2, parte 1. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1955.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., *La analogia del ser y el conocimiento de Dios en Suárez*. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1947.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., *Theodicea*, en la colección *Philosophiae Scholasticae Summa*, t. 3, parte 1. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1957.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., *Theologia naturalis, Tractatus metaphysicus*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1950.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Abstracción de tercer grado y objeto de la metafísica," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948), pp. 433-450.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "¿Defiende Suárez la real distinción de esencia y existencia en las criaturas?" *Pensamiento* 6 (1953), pp. 490-499.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "De la analogía del ser según Suárez," *Pensamiento* 2 (1946), pp. 267-294.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "De la analogía del ser y los posibles en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 2 (1946), pp. 267-294.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "El concepto formal en Suárez," *Pensamiento*, 18 (1962), pp. 407-432.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "El ente real y los posibles en Suárez," *Espíritu*, 10 (1961), pp. 146-163.

HELLÍN JOSÉ, S. J., "El ente y la existencia en Suárez", *Espíritu* 29 (1980), pp. 45-54.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "El principio de identidad conparada, según Suárez," *Pensamiento*, 6 (1950), pp. 435-463; 7 (1951), pp. 169-202.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Esencia de la relación predicamental según Suárez," *Las Ciencias* 23 (1958), pp. 648-697.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Existencialismo escolastico suareciano," *Pensamiento* 12 (1956), pp. 157-178; 13 (1957), pp. 21-38.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "La esencia del acto mistico y las disposiciones para él en Suárez," *ATG* 11 (1948), pp. 29-75.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "La gnoseologia del Doctor Exímio," *Revista Española de Teologia* 10 (1950), pp. 435-463.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "La metafísica de la posibilidad," *Las Ciencias* 21 (1956), pp. 455-477.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "La teoría de los modos en Suárez," *Pensamiento*, 6 (1950), pp. 216-226.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "La ubicación en el Doctor Exímio," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 5 (1926), pp. 272-283 & 390-405.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Las verdades esenciales se fundan en Dios, según Suárez," *Revista de Filosofia*, 22 (1963), pp. 19-42.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Líneas fundamentales del sistema metafísico de Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948), número extraordinario, pp. 123-167.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Más sobre el existencialismo escolástico suareciano," *Espíritu*, 30 (1981), pp. 161-170.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J.,"Necesidad de la analogía del ser según Suárez," *Pensamiento* 1 (1945), pp. 147-180.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Nociones de la potencia y del acto y sus mutuas relaciones, segun Suárez," *Ciencias* 17 (1952), pp. 90-118.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Obtención del concepto del ente, objecto de la metafísica," *Pensamiento*, 17 (1961), pp. 135-164.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Relaciones divinas y principio de identidad comparada," *Espíritu* 24 (1975), pp. 135-142.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre el constitutivo esencial y diferencial de la criatura," *Actas del IV centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez 1548-1948*, t. 1, pp. 251-290. Madrid: Direccion General de Propaganda, 1949.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre el constitutivo esencial y diferencial de la criatura según Suárez," *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* (Madrid 1949), I, pp. 251-290.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre el ser esencial y existencial en el ser creado. Descartes de un punto de vista suareciano," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, II (1949-1950), pp. 517-561.

HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre el tránsito de la potencia activa al acto según Suárez," *Razon y Fe* 138 (1948, número extraordinario), pp. 353-409.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre la inmensidad de Dios en Suárez," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 22 (1948), pp. 227-263.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre la limitación del acto por la potencia," *Las Ciencias* 16 (1951), pp. 329-365.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre la raíz de la limitación del ser según el P. Suárez," *XIII Congresso Luso-Espanhol Para o Progresso das Ciências* (1950), t. 7, pp. 69-110.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre la ubicación en Suárez y sobre su sistema metafísico," *Revista Española de Teologia*, 7 (1947), pp. 275-288.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J., "Sobre la unidad del ser en Suárez," *Giornale di Metafisica* 3 (1948), pp. 455-486.
HELLÍN, JOSÉ, S. J. "Suarezianismus," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 63 (2000), pp. 191-197.
HERNÁNDEZ, E., "La visión facial de Dios en esta vida según Suárez," *Manresa* 21- 4 (1949), pp. 140-150.
HERNÁNDEZ, M. C., "La internacionalidad de la filosofía de Francisco Suárez," *Congreso Internacional de Filosofía de Barcelona* 1948 (Madrid 1948), pp. 315-337.
HEYDTE, F.A. VON DER, "Seinsbegriff und Naturrecht bei Thomas von Aquin und F. Suárez," Innsbruck 1961 (*Festschrift für J. Messner*), II, pp. 254-259.
HOCEDEZ, EDGAR, "Suárez d'après un thomiste," *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* 49 (1922), pp. 85-97.
HOERES, WALTER, "Bewusstsein und Erkenntnisbild bei Suárez," *Scholastik* 36 (1961), pp. 192-216.
HOERES, WALTER, "Francis Suárez and the Teaching of Duns Scotus on 'Univocatio Entis,'" in RYAN, J. K. & BONANSEA, B. M. (eds.), *John Duns Scotus, 1265-1965. Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy* 3 (1965), pp. 263-294.
HOERES, WALTER, "Wesenheit und Individuum bei Suárez," *Scholastik* 37 (1962), pp. 181-210.
HONNEFELDER, LUDGER, *Scientia transcendens: die formale Bestimmung der Seiendheit und Realitât in der Metaphysik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit (Duns Scotus, Suárez, Wolff, Kant, Peirce)*. Hamburg: Meiner, 1990.
HUERGA, A., "F. Suárez, Doctoris Eximii, de ordine praedicatorum indole judicium," *Angelicum* 46 (Roma 1969), pp. 247-365.
HURTADO, GUILLERMO, "Entes e modos en las *Disputationes Metafísicas*," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 99-117.

IBÁÑEZ MARTÍ, J., "El Padre Suárez o la cultura peninsular del siglo de oro," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 8 (1948), pp. 11-31.
IBÁÑEZ MARTÍ, J., "Suárez, el filósofo peninsular," *Actas del IV Centenario de Suárez* (Madrid 1949), I, pp. 87-102.
IBERIGO, M., "Suárez y la metafísica," *Boletín del Instituto Peruano de Cultura Hispana* 2 (1948), pp. 27-45.
IGLESIAS, E., "El problema social contemporáneo y los principios de la filosofía social de Suárez," *Congreso Internacional de Filosofia de Barcelona* (Madrid 1949), II, pp. 197-211.
IRIARTE, JOAQUÍN, S. J., "La proyección sobre Europa de una metafísica, o Suárez en la filosofía de los días del Barroco," *Razón y Fe* 138 (1948), pp. 528-547; reproduced in *Pensadores e historiadores* (Madrid 1960), I, pp. 482-520.
IRIARTE, JOAQUÍN, S. J., "Suárez: una metafísica que se ilumina con El Escorial," in ID., *Pensares y pensadores*, Madrid, Ed. *Razon y Fe*, 1958, pp. 357-372.
IRIARTE, JOAQUÍN, S. J., "Una metafísica que ilumina el Escorial," *Razón y Fe* 136 (1947), pp. 176-190.
IRIARTE, M. DE, "El hombre Suárez y el hombre en Suárez," *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez* (Madrid 1949), I, pp. 103-147.
IRIARTE, M. DE, 'Francisco Suárez, un filósofo humanísimo," *Vida y carácter* (Madrid 1955), pp. 141-207.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "Conceptos dinámicos en la metafísica de Suárez," in *Homenaje al Doctor Exímio Padre Suárez, S.J. en el IV centenario de su nacimiento* (*Acta Salmanticensia. Derecho*, I-2, 1948), pp. 77-100.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "En torno al Ockhamismo de Suárez," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 19 (1945), pp. 61-130.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "Estudios sobre la metafísica de Francisco Suárez, S. I." Madrid: *Estudios Onienses*, Serie II, Vol. 1. 1949.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "Existencia tomista y subsistencia suareciana," in *Actas del I Congreso Nacional de Filosofía*, Mendoza (Argentina), Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, II (1950), pp. 798-804.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "Fuentes de la metafísica de Suárez," *Pensamiento*, 4 (1948), pp. 31-89.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "La noción de subsistencia y supósito en Suárez," *Estudios eclesiáticos* 17 (1948), pp. 33-74.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "Siewerth o la grandeza histórica de Suárez," *Razón y Fe* 162 (1960), pp. 113-115.
ITURRIOZ, JESÚS, "Un primer opúsculo de Suárez desconocido hasta ahora ('De essentia, existentia et subsistentia')," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 18 (1944), pp. 330-359.
IZAGA, L., "La soberania civil, segun Suárez," *Razon y Fe* 124 (1941), pp. 191-205; 314-316.

JANSEN, BERNHARD, "Der Konservativismus in den *Disputationes metaphysicae* des Suárez," *Gregorianum* 21 (1940), pp. 452-481.
JANSEN, BERNHARD, "Die Wesenart der Metaphysik des Suárez," *Scholastik* 15 (1940), pp. 161-185.
JANSEN, BERNHARD, "Franz Suárez als Metaphysiker," *Stimmen der Zeit* 95 (1918), pp. 509-514.
JARLOT, GEORGES, "Les idées politiques de Suárez et le pouvoir absolu," *Archives de philosophie* 18 (1949), pp. 64-107.
JARLOT, GEORGES, "Suárez, la démocratie et le pouvoir absolu," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 213-221.
JOLIVET, R., "Suárez et le problème du 'vinculum substantiale'," *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* (Burgos, 1949), I, pp. 235-250.
JOMBART, E., "Le 'voluntarisme' de la loi d'après Suárez," *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* 59 (1932), pp. 34-44.
JUGNET, L., "Essai sur les rapports entre la philosophie suarézienne de la matière et la pensée de Leibniz," *Revue d'histoire de la philosphie d'histoire générale de la civilization* 10 (1935), p. 126-136.
JUNCOSA CARBONELL, A., "Los conceptos de espacio y tiempo de la teoría de la relatividad contrastadas con la filosofía de Francisco Suárez," *Convivium* 11-12 (Barcelona 1961), pp. 3-43.
JUNK, N., *Die Bewegungslehre des Franz Suárez*, Innsbruck-Leipzig 1938.
KAINZ, HOWARD P., "The Suarezian Position on Being and the Real Distinction. An Analytical and Comparative Study," *The Thomist* 34 (1970), pp. 289-305.
KAROFSKY, AMY D., "Suárez' Doctrine of Eternal Truths," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 39 (2001), pp. 23-47.
KAROFSKY, AMY D., "Suárez's Influence on Descartes's Theory of Eternal Truths," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 10 (2001), pp. 241-262.
KNEBEL, SVEN K., *Wille, Würfel und Wahrscheinlichkeit: Das System der moralischen Notwendigkeit in der Jesuitenscholastik, 1550-1700*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000.
KNEBEL, SVEN K. "The Early Modern Rollback of Merely Extrinsic Denomination," *in Meeting of the Minds. The Relations between Medieval and Classical Modern European Philosophy*, ed. Stephen F. Brown, Turnhout, Brepols [Rencontres de philosophie médiévale, 7], pp. 317-331.
KNELLER, C.A., "Alcalá, y Suárez," *Zeitschrift fur katholische Theologie* 42 (1918), pp. 199-201.
KNIGHT, DAVID M., " Suárez's Approach to Substantial Form," *The Modern Schoolman* 34 (1957), pp. 147-191; 39 (1961/1962), pp. 219-239.
KOBUSCH, THEO, "Die Lehre vom moralischen Sein in der Philosophie des F. Suárez," in Id., *Die Entdeckung der Person. Metaphysik der Freiheit*

und modernes Menschenbild, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993, pp. 55-66.
KOCH, L., "Suárez", *Jesuitenlexikon*, Paderborn 1935, col. 1716-1718.
KONEMANN, E., *The Honesty of Concupiscent Love of God in Francis Suárez*, Roma 1966.
KREMER, MARKUS, "Tugend und Gesetz bei Francisco Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.
KRONEN, JOHN D., "Essentialism Old and New: Suárez and Brody," *The Modern Schoolman* 68 (1991), pp. 123-151.
KRONEN, JOHN D., "The Importance of the Concept of Substantial Unity in Suárez's Argument for Hylomorphism," *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65-3 (1991), pp. 335-360.
KRONEN, JOHN D., "The Problem of the Continuant: Aquinas and Suárez on Prime Matter and Substantial Generation," with Sandra Menssen and Thomas Sullivan, *The Review of Metaphysics*, Volume LIII, # 4 (June, 2000), pp. 863-885.
KRONEN, JOHN D., "Substances are not Windowless: A Suarezian Critique of Monadism," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, Volume LXXI, Winter 1997, No. 1, 53-81.
LABROUSSE, R., "En torno a F. Suárez," *Notas y Estudios de Filosofía* (Tucumán, Argentina) 3 (1952), pp. 381-386.
LAREQUI, J., "El Padre Suárez creador del concepto de Derecho internacional," *Razón y Fe* 83 (1928), pp. 225-240.
LAREQUI, J., "Influencia de Suárez en la filosofía de Grocio," *Razón y Fe* (1929), pp. 226-242.
LARRAINZAR, CARLOS, *Una introducción a Francisco Suárez*, Pamplona, EUNSA, 1977.
LEGAZ LACAMBRA, "Vitoria, Suárez y nosotros," *Finisterre* 6 (1948).
LEITE, A., "Uma obra inédita de Suárez," *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 4 (1948), pp. 409-412.
LEIWESMEIER, JOSEF, *Die Gotteslehre bei Franz Suárez*, Paderborn, F. Schöningh, 1938.
LEIWESMEIER, JOSEF, "Unsere Erkenntnis Gottes und die Analogia entis nach der Lehre des Francisco Suárez," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 122 (1941), pp. 73-90; 191-200.
LESLIE BRIERLY, J., "Comunidad internacional en Suárez," *Actas* del *IV Centenario del nacimiento de Suárez*, 1548-1948, vol. II (Madrid 1948), pp. 250-267.
LESLIE BRIERLY, J., "The Realisation Today of Suárez' World Community," *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimiento de Suárez*, 1548-1948, vol. II (Madrid 1948), pp. 271-279.

LIMA DE CARVALHO, A., "Francisco Suárez. Sua posição no tempo," *Estudos* 27 (Coimbra 1949), pp. 1-7.

LLEONART AMSELEM, A. J.,"Aportación de Suárez al derecho internacional del desarollo," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 171-178.

LLORCA, B., "El P. Suárez y la inquisición española en 1594. Memorial del mismo sobre la cuestión 'De Auxiliis divinae gratiae," *Gregorianum* 17 (1936), pp. 437-451.

LLORCA, B., "La inquisición española y el libro póstumo del Padre Francisco Suárez 'De vera intelligentia,'" in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 7 (1938), pp. 240-256.

LLOYD, HOWELL A., "Constitutionalism", in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, ed. James Henderson Burns / Mark Goldie (ed.), Cambridge University Press,1991, pp. 254-297.

LOHR, CHARLES H., "Jesuit Aristotelianism and Sixteenth-Century Metaphysics," *Paradosis. Studies in Memory of Edwin A. Quain*. New York, 1976.

LOMBARDO, MARIO GAETANO, *La forma che dà l'essere alle cose. Enti di ragione e bene trascendentale in Suárez, Leibniz, Kant*, Milano, Istituto Propaganda Libraria, 1995.

LOPETEGUI, LEÓN, "La Secretaria de Estado de Paulo V y la composicion del 'Defensio fidei' de Suárez," *Estudios eclesiasticos* 27 (1946), pp. 584-596.

LÓPEZ DE PRADO, JOAQUÍN, "Introducción doctrinal a la concepción suareciana de la ley," *Miscelánea Comillas* 47-48 (1967), pp. 569-622.

LÓPEZ MOLINA, ANTONIO, "Teoría del ente finito en Suárez," in *Etica y sociologia*, ed. L. Méndez, Madrid, Universidad Complutense, 2000, pp. 645-666.

LOREÑA GARCÍA, CLAUDIA, "Descartes y Suárez: sobre la falsedad judicativa," *Analogía filosófica* 12 (1998), pp.125-150.

LUDWIG, G., *Metaphysische Grundfragen der Erziehungswissenschaft. Der Satz des Aristoteles: Alle Menschen streben von Natur aus nach Wissen in der Interpretation des Francisco Suárez*, Wuppertal, Henn, 1970.

LUDWIG, J., *Das akausale Zusammenwirken (Sympathie) der Seelenvermögen in der Erkenntnislehre des Suárez*, München 1929.

MADRID RAMÍREZ, RAÚL, "La cuestión de la 'lex aeterna' en Suárez: una comparación sobre bases tomistas," *Persona y Derecho* 40 (1999), pp. 157-173.

MACIÁ MANSO, RAMÓN, *Derecho y justicia en Suárez*, Granada, Universidad de Granada, Facultad de Derecho, Departamento. de Filosofía del Derecho [Monografías de filosofía jurídica y política], 1968.

MAHIEU, LÉON, *François Suárez, sa philosophie et les rapports qu'elle a avec sa théologie*, Paris, 1921.

MAQUART, X., "Reflexions sur la critique suarezienne du bannezianisme," *Revue Thomiste* 2 (1937).
MARC, ANDRÉ, "L'idée de l'être chez Saint Thomas et dans la scolastique postérieure," *Archives de philosophie* 10 (1933), pp. 1-44.
MARÍAS, JULIÁN, *Suárez en la perspectiva de la razón histórica. Ensayos de teoría*, Barcelona, Barna 1955.
MARÍAS, JULIÁN, "Suárez en la perspectiva de la razón histórica," *Finisterre* 6 (Madrid 1948), pp. 137-159.
MARION, JEAN-LUC, "À propos de Suárez et Descartes," in *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, 50 (1996), pp. 109-131 etc,
MARION, JEAN-LUC, "Sostanza e sussistenza. Suárez e il trattato della substantia nei Principia I, 51-54", in *Descartes: Principia Philosophiae (1644-1994)*, edd. Jean-Robert Armogathe, Giulia Belgioioso, Napoli, 1996, pp. 203-229.
MARION, JEAN-LUC, "Substance et subsistance. Suárez et le traité de la *substantia* dans les *Principia* I, § 51-54", in Id., *Questions cartésiennes*, II, Paris, PUF, 1996, pp. 91-99.
MARTÍN, PALMA, J., "La potencia obediencial activa en el plano metafísico según Suárez," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 16 (1953), pp. 327-375.
MARTINEZ GÓMEZ, L., "Evaluación de Francisco Suárez filosofo," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 5-26.
MARTINEZ GÓMEZ, L., "Lo existencial en la analogía de Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948, *número extraordinario*), pp. 215-243.
MARTÍNEZ GÓMEZ, L., "Suárez". En: Literatura filosófica española e hispanoamericana," in *Pensamiento* 6 (1950) 274-279; 7 (1951), pp. 426-428.
MARTÍNEZ GÓMEZ, L., Suárez y la raíces espirituales del Barroco español," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de filosofía*, 16 (1989), pp. 127-145.
MARTINS, ANTÓNIO MANUEL, "Tópica metafísica: de Fonseca a Suárez," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 157-168.
MARTINS, D., "Um manuscrito bracarense do Doutor Exímio," in *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 4 (1948), pp. 395-408.
MARXUACH, F., "El autotomismo del Padre Suárez," *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 6 (1927), pp. 429-432
MAS HERRERA, ÓSCAR, "La esencia y la existencia: Santo Tomás y Francisco Suárez," *Revista de filosofía de la Universidad de Costa Rica* 37 (1999), pp. 115-122.
MASI, ROBERTO, *Il movimento assoluto e la posizione assoluta secondo il Suárez. La particolare teoría suaresiana del movimento e della presenza nel luogo*. Roma: Lateranum (Serie Filosofica 1), 1947.
MASI, ROBERTO, *La teoría suaresiana della presenza eucaristica*. Roma, Azienda Libreria Cattolica Italiana, 1942.

MASI, ROBERTO, "Intorno ad una critica alla presenza assoluta di F. Suárez," *Divus Thomas* (Piacenza) 54 (1951), pp. 385-400.
MAY, WILLIAM, "The Natural Law Doctrine of Francis Suárez," *The New Scholasticism* 58 (1984), pp. 409-423.
MCCORMICK, J.F., "The Significance of Suárez for a Revival of Scholasticism," *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy*, New York 1932.
McGANN, TH., "Suárez y el personalismo," *Pensamiento* 14 (1958), pp. 487-502.
MÉCHOUALAN, HENRY, "Suárez ante algunas preguntas morales y politicas," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 121-132.
MENDÍA, B., "Influencia de los maestros franciscanos en la psicología del conocimiento intelectual de Suárez," *Verdad y Vida* 6 (1948), pp. 421-453.
MENN, STEPHEN, "Suárez, Nominalism and Modes," in K. White (éd.), *Hispanic Philosophy in the Age of Discovery*, ed. Kevin White, Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1997, pp. 201-225.
MERÊA, PAULO, *Suárez, Grocio, Hobbes. Lições de história das doutrinas politicas feitas na Universidade de Coimbra*, Coimbra, Editor Arménio Amado, 1941.
MESNARD, PIERRE, *Suárez, modernité traditionelle de sa philosophie*. Paris, 1949.
MESNARD, PIERRE, "Comment Leibniz se trouva placé dans le sillage de Suárez," *Archives de Philosophie* 18-1 (1949), pp. 7-32.
MESNARD, PIERRE, "Suárez," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 15 (1972), New York, pp. 362-363.
MINGES, PARTHENIUS, "Suárez und Duns Scotus," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 32 (1919), pp. 334-340.
MIRANDA BARBOSA, A., "A individuação nas disputas metafísicas de Suárez," *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* (Burgos 1949), I,pp. 339-360.
MOLINA MELIÁ, ANTONIO, *Iglesia y Estado en el Siglo de Oro español. El pensamiento de Francisco Suárez*, Valencia, 1977.
MONACO, N., "La metafisica di Suárez e la metafisica di Tomas d'Aquino," *Revista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, 10 (1918), pp. 37-65.
MONNOT, P., DUMONT, PAUL, BROUILLARD, R., "Suárez," *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* XIV, 2, col. 2638-2728, Paris 1941.
MONTAG, JOHN, "Revelation: The False Legacy of Suárez," in *Radical Orthodoxy. A New Theology*, London-New York, Routledge, 1999, pp. 38-63.
MONTERO DÍAZ, S., *Programa para el cursillo sobre el pensamiento de Francisco. Suárez*, Murcia 1940.
MORABITO, G, "Essere e causalità in Suárez e in San Tommaso," *Rivista di Filosofia Neoscolastica* 31 (1939), pp. 18-46; 32 (1940), pp. 367-415.

MORABITO, G., "L'idea dell'essere e la trascendenza divina in Suárez e in S. Tomaso d` Aquino," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*. 6 (1941), pp. 196-218; 417-432.
MORI, G., *Il motivo della fede da Gaetano a Suárez*, Roma, 1953.
MUELLER, H. J., *Die Lehre vom 'verbum mentis' in der spanischen Scholastik. Untersuchungen zur historischen Entwicklung und zum Verstandnis dieser Lehre bei Toletus, den Conimbricensern und Suárez*.. Munster 1968.
MULLANEY, THOMAS V., *Suárez on Human Freedom*, Baltimore, 1950.
MULLANEY, THOMAS V., "The Basis of the Suarezian Teaching on Human Freedom," *The Thomist* 11 (1948), pp. 1-17; 330-69; 448-502; 12, pp. 59-94; 155-206.
MUÑOZ, JESÚS, "El origen de las ideas en Suárez y Balmes. Paralelo," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 417-432.
MUÑOZ,, JESÚS, "Errores atribuidos a F. Suárez," *Filosofia oggi*, 14 (1991), pp. 624-625.
MUÑOZ, JESÚS, "Esencia del libre albedrío y proceso del acto libre según F. Romeo, S. Tomás y Francisco Suárez. Estudio comparativo," *Misccelánia Comillas* 9 (148), pp. 347-504.
MUÑOZ, JESÚS, "Nuestras ideas y su origen en Suárez y Balmes," (Estudio comparativo), *Pensamiento* 5 (1949), pp. 297-317; 6 (1950), pp. 5-31.–Cf. ID, *Congreso Intern.acional de Filosofia de Barcelona* 1948 (Madrid 1949), III, pp. 417-432.
MUÑOZ DELGADO, VICENTE, "La Filosofia de Suárez y Amor Ruibal," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 211-234.
NEIDL, WALTER M., "Der Realitätsbegriff des Franz Suárez nach den *Disputationes metaphysicae*," *Münchener Theologische Studien* 2, Bd. 33 (1966).
NICOL, EDUARDO, "En el centenario de Francisco Suárez. Propriedad y comunidad," in *Las Españas. Historia de una revista en exilio, 1946-1963* (México, Colegio de Mexico, 1999), pp. 615-622.
NOLAN, P, "The Suarezian Modes," *Proceedings, Annual Convention Jesuit Education Association*. Chicago, 1931.
NOREÑA, CARLOS G. "Francisco Suárez on Democracy and International Law," in *Hispanic Philosophy in the Age of Discovery* (Washington, D.C., 1997), 257-271.
NOREÑA, CARLOS G., "Heidegger on Suárez: The 1927 Marburg Lectures," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 23-4 (1983), pp. 407-424.
NOREÑA, CARLOS G., "Ockham and Suárez on the Ontological Status of Universal Concepts," *The New Scholasticism* 45-3 (1981), pp. 348-362.
NOREÑA, CARLOS G., "Suárez and Spinoza: The Metaphysics of Modal Being," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de filosofía*, 12 (1985), pp. 163-182.

NOREÑA, CARLOS P., "Suárez and the Jesuits," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65 (1991), 267-286.
NOREÑA, CARLOS G., "Suárez on the Externality and Internality of Relations," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de filosofía*, vol. 10.
NUÑO, J.A., "La raíz psicologista de la analogía del ser en Suárez como antecedente del idealismo cartesiano," *Cultura Universitaria* 64 (Caracas 1958), pp. 67-73.
O'CALLAGHAN, J., "Categorías estéticas en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 20 (1964), pp. 466-476.
OLIVO, GILLES,. "L'efficience en cause: Suárez, Descartes et la question de la causalité," in *Descartes et le Moyen Age*, edd. Joël Biard, Roshdi Rashed, Paris, Vrin, 1997, pp. 91-105.
OLIVO, GILLES, "L'homme en personne. Descartes, Suárez, et la question de l'*ens per se*," in *Descartes et Regius. Autour de l'explication de l'esprit humain*, ed. THEO Verbeek, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi, 1993, pp. 69-91.
OLIVO, GILLES, "L'impossibilité de la puissance: les conditions de la pensée de l'individu chez Suárez," in *L'individu dans la pensée moderne XVIe-XVIIIe siècles / L'individuo nel pensiero moderno. Secoli XVI-XVIII*, ed. Gian Maria Cazzaniga/Yves Charles Zarka, 2 vol. (Pisa, 1995).
ONG-VAN-CUNG, KIM SANG, "Substance et distinctions chez Descartes, Suárez et leurs prédecesseurs médiévaux," in *Descartes et le Moyen-Age*, edd. Joël Biard, Roshdi Rashed, Paris, Vrin, 1997, pp. 215-229.
ORTIZ IBARZ, JOSÉ MARIA, *La participación como razón constitutiva del mundo. El constitutivo formal del ente finito según Francisco Suárez*, Barcelona, 1991.
ÖRY, N., "Suárez in Rom. Seine römische Lehrtätigkeit auf Grund handschriftlicher Überlieferung," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 81 (1959), pp. 133-147.
OSUNA, A., "El poder de la Iglesia de Vitoria a Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 7 (1980), pp. 81-106.
OWENS, JOSEPH, "The Number of Terms in the Suarezian Discussion on Essence and Being," *The Modern Schoolman* 34 (1956/1957), pp. 147-191.
PARPAL Y MARQUÉS, C., "La psicología del Padre Suárez," *Conmemoración del III Centenario de Suárez en Barcelona* (Barcelona 1923), pp. 149-177.
PAULUS, J., "Les attitudes métaphysiques et leur présupposés psychologiques," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Barcelona* 1948 (Madrid 1949), II (1949), pp. 387-396.
PECCORINI, FRANCISCO L., "Knowledge of the Singular: Aquinas, Suárez and Recent Interpreters," *The Thomist* 38 (1974), pp. 605-655.
PECCORINI, FRANCISCO L., "Suárez's Struggle with the Problem of the One and the Many," *The Thomist* 36 (1972), pp. 433-471.

PÉCHARMAN, MARTINE, "Les fondements de la notion d'unité du peuple chez Suárez," in *Aspects de la pensée médiévale dans la philosophie politique moderne*, ed. Yves Charles Zarka, Paris, PUF, 1991, pp. 104-126.

PEÑA, JAVIER, "Droit naturel et idée du politique: Spinoza face à Suárez," in *Aspects de la pensée médiévale dans la philosophie politique moderne*, ed. Yves Charles Zarka, Paris, PUF, 1999, pp. 191-209.

PEÑA, JAVIER, "Souveraineté de Dieu et pouvoir du prince chez Suárez," in *Potentia Dei. L'onnipotentia divina nel pensiero dei secoli XVI e XVII*, edd. Guido Canziani, Miguel A. Granada, Yves Charles Zarka, Milano, Franco Angeli [Filosofia e Scienza nel Cinquecento e nel Seicento], 2000, pp. 195-213.

PEREIRA, JOSÉ, "John of St. Thomas and Suárez," *Acta Philosophica* 4-2 (1995), 115-136.

PEREIRA, JOSÉ, "O integralismo existencial de Suárez. *In calumniatorem Doctoris Eximii.*," *Revista Filosófica de Coimbra* 7-14 (1998), pp. 295-312.

PEREIRA, JOSÉ, "The Achievement of Suárez and the Suarezianization of Thomism," in Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 133-156.

PEREIRA, JOSÉ, "The Existentialism of Suárez. Reevaluation of Gilson's Allegation of Suarezian Essentialism," *Gregorianum* 85/4, 2004, pp. 660-688.

PEREIRA, JOSÉ, "The Human Person, Ideal and Fallen, in Classical Catholic Theology," *Dialogue & Alliance* 10-2 (1996), pp. 41-55.

PEREIRA, JOSÉ, ESTEVES, "Francisco Suárez na história do pensamento português. Alguns aspectos". In: *Filosofía hispánica y diálogo intercultural. Actas del X Seminario de Historia de la Filosofía Española e Iberoamericana*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca—Fundación Gustavo Bueno, 2000, pg. 413-423.

PEREÑA VICENTE, LUCIANO, "La génesis suareciana del 'ius gentium'," *Corpus Hispanorum de Pace*, Madrid, 1973, XIV, pp. xix-lxxiii.

PEREÑA VICENTE, LUCIANO, "Suárez y la independencia de América," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 7 (1980), pp. 53-64.

PÉREZ SAN MARTÍN, HÉCTOR, "Determinación del objeto y estudio de la metafísica, sus límites y su correlato con el nombre de esta ciencia según el pensamiento del P. Francisco Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 26 (1999), pp. 5-39.

PÉREZ-CUESTA, LUIS, "Los jesuitas y la autoridad. La teoría de Francisco Suárez," *Iberoamericana Pragensia* 32 (1998), pp. 31-42.

PERLER, DOMINIK, "Luis de Molina und Francisco Suárez' *concursus*-Theorie," in Ulrich Rudolph / Dominik Perler, *Occasionalismus. Theorien der Kausalität im arabisch-islamischen und im europäischen Denken* (Göttingen, 2000), pp. 201-211.

PETERSEN, S., *Geschichte der aristotelischen Philosophie im protestantischen Deutschland*, Leipzig 1921.
PICARD, G., "L'intelligibile intraspecifique d'après Saint Thomas et Suárez," *Archives de Philosophie* 1 (1923), pp. 63-80.
PICARD, G., "Le thomisme de Suárez," *Archives de philosophie* 18 (1949), pp. 108-128.
PINK, THOMAS, "Suárez, Hobbes and the Scholastic Tradition in Action Theory," in Pink, Thomas & Stone, M.W.F. (edd.), *The Will and Human Action: from Antiquity to the Present Day*. Routledge 2004, pp. 127-153.
PINO, AURELIO DEL, "La *Defensio Fidei* de Suárez," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943).
PIRES, CELESTINO, "Acto da esência ou esência em acto?" *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofía* 4 (1948), pp. 412-414.
PITA, E. B., "Aristoteles, Santo Tomás u Suárez," *Ciencia y Fe* 4 (1948) pp. 7-19. ID, Id., *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* (Madrid 1949) II, pp. 195-209.
PITA, E. B., "Conmemoración de F. Suárez." En: *Actas del I Congreso Nacional de Filosofia* (Mendoza-Argentina 1950), I, pp. 567-574.
PLATHOW, MICHAEL, *Das Problem des concursus divinus. Das Zusammenwirken von göttlichem Schöpferwirken und geschöpflichem Eigenwirken in K. Barths 'Kirchlicher Dogmatik'*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie, 32], 1976, pp. 49-60.
POZO, CÁNDIDO, "La Trinidad y María en la obra 'De mysteriis vitae Christi' de Francisco Suárez," *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 63 (2000), pp. 5-16.
PULIDO MENDEZ, M. A., "Suárez y el existencialismo," *Boletín del Instituto Peruano de Cultura Hispánica* 2 (1948), pp. 3-26.
PUY MUÑOZ, FRANCISCO, "Los conceptos de derecho, justitia y ley en el 'De legibus' de Francisco Suárez (1548-1617)," *Persona y derecho* 40 (1999), pp. 175-195.
QUILES, ISMAEL, *Francisco Suárez, S. J. Su metafísica*. DEPALMA (ed.). Buenos Aires 1989.
QUILES, ISMAEL, "Influjo del elemento psicológico en ciertos juicios acerca de los méritos de Suárez." En: *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez* (Madrid 1949) I, pp. 149-180.
QUILES, ISMAEL, "La intuición fundamental de la metafísica de Suárez," *Fascículos de la Biblioteca* 3 (1941), pp. 51-96.
RÁBADE ROMEO, SERGIO., "Influencia de Durando en la metafísica de Suárez," *Estudios* 53 (1961), pp. 249-263.
RÁBADE ROMEO, SERGIO, "Influencia de Suárez en la filosofía moderna," Madrid, *Cuadernos de Pensamiento* 6 (1991), pp. 73-83.

RÁBADE ROMEO, SERGIO.,"La metafísica suareciana y la acusación de esencialismo," *Anales de la cátedra de Francisco Suárez* 3 (Granada 1963), pp. 73-86.

RAST, MAX, S. J., "Die Possibilienlehre des Franz Suárez," *Scholastik* 10 (1935), pp. 340-368.

RECASENS SICHES, LUIS, *La Filosofia del derecho de Francisco Suárez, con un estudio previo sobre sus antecedentes en la patristica y en la escolastica*, Madrid, Libreria General de Victoriano Suárez, 1927.

RENEMANN, MICHAEL,"Suárez on Art Production," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

RIEDL, CLARE C., "Suárez and the Organization of Learning," in GERARD SMITH (ed.), *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1939.

RINALDI, TERESA, *Francisco Suárez. Cognitio singularis materialis: De Anima*, Bari, Levante, 1998.

RINALDI, TERESA,"L'azione volontaria e la libertà nel pensiero di F. Suárez: Una questione antropologica," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.

RIVA, FRANCO, "La dottrina suareziana del concetto e le sue fonti storiche," *Rivista de filosfia neo-scolastica* 71 (1979), pp. 686-699.

RIVERA DE VENTOSA, A., "El agustinismo politico en Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 107-121.

RIVIÈRE, P.F., *Suárez et son oeuvre a l'occasion du troisiéme centénaire de sa mort*, Paris 1918.

ROBINET, ANDRÉ, "L'informatique appliquée à l'oeuvre de Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 327-336.

ROBINET, ANDRÉ, "Suárez dans l'oeuvre de Leibniz," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 191-209.

ROBINET, ANDRÉ., "Suárez im Werk von Leibniz," *Studia Leibnitiana*, XIII (1981), pp. 76-96.

ROBLEDA, O., "'Aequitas' en Aristóteles, Santo Tomás y Suárez. Estudio comparativo," *Miscelánea Comillas* 15 (1951), pp. 241-279.

RODRIGUES, A. M. M., "Influência de Suárez na opção brasileira pela Filosofia eclética." *Revista Brasileira de Filosofia* 25 (1974), pp. 138-146.

RODRIGUEZ, F., "La docencia romana de Suárez", *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 295-315.

RODRIGUES, F., "O 'Doutor Exímio' na Universidade de Coimbra," *Broteria* 24 (1937), pp. 437-451.

RODRIGUES, F., "Problemas de edición de un texto de Suárez recientemente publicado, *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 38 (1963), pp. 93-98. (Sobre la edición de S. Giers, De iustitia et iure, Freiburg 1958).

RODRÍGUEZ LUÑO, ÁNGEL, "La virtù dell'epicheia. Teoria, storia e applicazione. I. Dalla Grecia classica a F. Suárez,",*Acta philosophica* 6 (1997), pp. 197-236.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., *Estudios de metafísica*. LIPE, serie Estudio, num. 2. Barcelona: Editorial Flors, 1959.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Aspectos hispánicos de la filosofía de F. Suárez," *Espiritu, Conocimiento, Actualidad* 3 (Barcelona 1953), pp. 30-38.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Caracter absoluto del cononcimiento en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 15 (1959), pp. 401-438.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Desde la admisión de la verdad necesária hasta la demostración de la existencia de Dios," *Pensamiento* 8 (1952), pp. 31-52.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "El ente y el ser," *Crisis* 5 (1958), pp. 399-407.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Fundamentación trascendental de la metafísica," *Pensamiento* 21 (1965), pp. 65-90.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Investigación sobre la noción de substancia," *Pensamiento* 19 (1963), pp. 23-51.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "La analogia del ser en Suárez," *Espíritu* 95 (1987), pp. 5-18.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "La intuición del ser en Rosmini, frente a la abstracción del concepto de ser en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 11 (1955), pp. 433-451.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "La metafísica de F. Suárez, magna obra de Filosofia cristiana," *Cristiandad* 5 (1948), pp. 374-378.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "La oposición 'individuo-universal' en los siglos XIV-XV, punto de partida de Suárez", *Espíritu* 10 (Barcelona 1961), pp. 189-200. Cfr. ID. *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter. Internationalen Kongresses für Mittelalterliche Philosophie. (Thomas Institut Univ. Köln 2)*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963, pp. 667-678.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "La 'potencia obediencial` según Suárez, en los confines entre filosofía y teología." *Pensamiento* 17 (1961), pp. 77-87.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "La síntesis metafísica de Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948), pp. 169-214.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Metafísica de la forma," *Pensamiento* 14 (1958), pp. 263-286.
ROIG GIRONELLA, JUAN, S. J., "Para la historia del nominalismo y de la reacción antinominalista de Suárez," *Pensamiento* 17 (1961), pp. 279-310.
ROMEYER, BLAISE, "La théorie suarézienne d'un état de nature pure," *Archives de philosophie* 18 (1949), pp. 37-63.

ROMITI, G., "L'imperium nell'atto umano completo secondo Tomasso d'Aquino e Francesco Suárez," *Humanitas* 4 (Brescia 1949), pp. 1152-1155.

ROMMEN, HEINRICH, *La teoría del estado y de la comunidad internacional en Francisco Suárez*, estudio preliminar de Enrique Gomez Arboleya, traduccion del aleman por Valentin Garcia Yebra, Buenos Aires / Madrid, Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales / Instituto Francisco de Vitoria, 1951.

ROMMEN, HEINRICH, *Die Staatslehre des Franz Suárez*, Mönchengladbach, 1926.

ROMMEN, HEINRICH, "Gesetz und Freiheit in der Rechts- und Staatslehre von Suárez," *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez*, 1548-1948, vol. II, (Madrid 1948), pp. 245-258.

ROSANAS, JUAN, "El princípio de individuación según Suárez," *Ciencia y fe* 6 (1950), pp. 69-86.

ROSANAS, JUAN, La teoría metafísica suareciana sobre los modos," *Ciencia y fe* 15 (1948, número extraordinario), pp. 32-42.

ROSENBERG, J. R., *The Principles of Individuation. A Comparative Study of S. Thomas, Scotus and Suárez*, Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950.

ROSS, J. F., "Introduction," in *Francis Suárez. On Formal and Universal Unity. Philosophy* Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press 1964, pp. 1-27.

ROSS, J. F., "Suárez on 'Universals'," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (New York 1962), pp. 736-748.

RÖSSELER, H., "Die Entstehung der sinnlichen Wahrnehmung und der Verstandeserkenntnis nach Suárez", *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 35 (1922), pp. 185-198.

ROUBINET, P., "Immatérialité de l'intellect et immortalité de l'ame chez Suárez," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 269-284.

SAGÜÉS ITURRALDE, JOSÉ F., "Escoto y la eficacia del concurso divino ante Suárez," *Acta Congressus Scotistici Internationalis Oxonii et Edimburghi 1966*. Vol. 4., Rome 1968. Also in *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 41 (1966), pp. 483-514.

SAGÜÉS ITURRALDE, JOSÉ F., "Escoto y la eficacia del concurso divino ante Suárez," *De docrina Joannis Duns Scoti*, vol 4., Rome 1968, pp. 339-374.

SAGÜÉS ITURRALDE, JOSÉ F., "Suárez ante la sciencia media," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 22 (1948), pp. 265-310.

SALAVERRI, J., "La eclesiologia de Francisco Suárez," *Actas del IV Centenaario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez* (Madrid 1949), II, pp. 39-54.

SAINZ, SALIS-SEEWIS, F, *La vera dottrina di S. Agostino, di S. Tomasso e di P. Suárez contra la generazione primitiva*, Roma 1972.

SANCHO IZQUIERDO, MIGUEL, "Suárez y la Filosofia del derecho," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943).
SANTOS, D., "Objeto da metafísica em Suárez," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía de Barcelona* 1948 (Madrid 1949), I, pp. 327-338.
SANZ, VICTOR, *La teoría de la posibilidad en Francisco Suárez*, Pamplona, EUNSA, 1989.
SASSEN, FERDINAND L. R., "La influencia de Suárez en las Universidades protestantes de los Países Bajos en los siglos XVII y XVIII," *Actas*, etc., III (1948), pp. 469-471.
SCANNONE, JUAN CARLOS, "Lo social y lo político según Francisco Suárez. Hacia una relectura latinoamericana actual de la filosofía política de Suárez", in *Lo político en América Latina*, Buenos Aires, Bonum, 1999, pp. 239-380.
SCHMUTZ, JACOB, "Abatir o ensalzar a Francisco Suárez?"in Francisco Suárez, *Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.
SCHMUTZ, JACOB,"Science divine et métaphysique chez Francisco Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.
SCHMUTZ, JACOB, "Un Dieu indifférent. La crise de la science divine dans la scolastique moderne," in *Le Contemplateur et les idées. Modèles de la science divine du néoplatonisme aux Temps modernes*, ed. Olivier Boulnois, Jacob Schmutz, Jean-Luc Solère, Paris: Vrin, 2002, pp. 185-221.
SCHNEIDER, MARIUS, "Der angebliche philosophische Essentialismus des Suárez," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 24 (1961), pp. 40-68.
SCHNEPF, ROBERT, "Zum kausalen Vokabular am Vorabend der 'wissenschaftlichen Revolution' des 17. Jahrhunderts: Der Ursachenbegriff bei Galilei und die 'aristotelische' *causa efficiens* im System der Ursachen bei Suárez," in *Kausalität und Naturgesetz in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Andreas Hüttemann, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001, pp. 8-38.
SCHNET, G., *Das Verhältnis von Vernunftigkeit und Göttlichkeit des Glaubens bei Suárez*, Marendorff 1929.
SCHONDORF HARALD, "Individuum und Indifferenz. Francisco Suárez, Philosoph im Geis des Ignatius," *Stimmen der Zeit* 209 (1991), pp. 109-122.
SCHONDORF, HARALD,"La nada real: La doctrina de los entes posibles en las *Disputaciones Metafísicas* de Francisco Suárez," *Francisco Suárez, Der ist der Mann. Libro Homenaje as Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*. Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer. *Analecta Valentina*, November 12, 2004.
SCHRODER, R., "Suárez on the Temporal Power of the Pope", *Studies* 30 (Dublin 1941), pp. 425-438.

SCHUSTER, J., "Der gebundene Moralpositivismus des Franz Suárez nach Herbert Spiegelberg,' *Scholastik* 12 (1937), pp. 94-101.
SCIMÉ, SALVATORE, "Valore storico del pensiero di Suárez," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 473-489.
SEIGFRIED, HANS, *Wahrheit und Metaphysik bei Suárez*, Bonn: H. Bouvier, 1967.
SEIGFRIED, HANS, "Kant's Spanish Bank Account: Realität und Wirklichkeit," in *Interpreting Kant*, éd. M. Gram. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1982, pp. 115-132.
SEIGFRIED, HANS, "Kant's Thesis about Being Anticipated by Suárez?" *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1970, pp. 510-520.
SEIGFRIED, HANS, "Wahrheit und Metaphysik bei Suárez," *Abhandlungen zur Philosophie, Psychologie und Pädagogik* 32 (1967) pp. 185-194.
SEILER, J., *Der Zweck in der Philosophie des Franz Suárez*. Innsbruck: Fhilosophie und Grenzwissenschaften, Band 5, 6. 1936.
SELVAGGI, F., "'Praesentia per modum substantiae' apud S. Thomam et apud Suárez," *Doctor Communis* 17 (1964), pp. 20-43.
SEMERIA, G.B., "Francesco Suárez. In margine alla storia della Filosofia," *Saggi... clandestini (storico-filosofici)*, Alba 1967, I, pp. 161-202.
SEPICH, JUAN R., "Naturaleza de la filosofía primera o metafísica en Francisco Suárez," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 491-504.
SIEWERTH, GUSTAV, *Das Schicksal der Metaphysik von Thomas zu Heidegger*, Einsiedeln, (1959).
SIEWERTH, GUSTAV, "Die Suarezische Verbegrifflichung des thomasischen Seins,' *Theologie Philosophie* 49 (1974), pp. 324-342.
SOLA, F. DE P., "Un trabajo inédito del P. Juan Muncunill S. I. 'Eximius Doctor Pater Suárez, fidelis S. Thomae discipulus," *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 22 (1948) nn. 85-86.
SOLANA, MARCIAL, "Doctrina de Suárez sobre el primer principio metafísico. Novedad que ofrece. Juicio sobre la misma," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948, *Número extraordinario*), pp. 245-270.
SOLANA, MARCIAL, "Los primeros principios del conocimiento en orden a la demostración según la doctrina del Padre Suárez de la Compañía de Jesús," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 Octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, I (1949), pp.197-243.

SOLANA, MARCIAL,"Suárez, maestro de Metafísica para teólogos", *Homenaje al Doctor Exímio Prancisco Suárez, S.J. en el IV Centenario de su Nacimiento* (*Acta Salmanticensia. Derecho*, I-2, 1948), pp. 45-76.
SOLANO, JESÚS, "Un manuscrito inédito sobre la predestinacion," *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez 1548-1948*, Madrid, Dirección General de Propaganda, 1948, II, pp. 177-196.
SOMMERVILLE, JOHANN P., "From Suárez to Filmer. A Reappraisal," *Historical Journal* 25 (1982), pp. 525-540.
SOUTH, JAMES B.,"Singular and Universal in Suárez's Account of Cognition," *Review of Metaphysics* 55-4 (2002), pp. 785-823.
SOUTH, JAMES B., "Suárez and the Problem of External Sensation," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 10 (2000), pp. 217-240.
SOUTH, JAMES B., "Suárez on Imagination," *Vivarium* 39 (2001), pp.119-158.
SPANEDDA, FRANCESCO, *L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suárez*, Gallizi-Sassari, 1937?
SPECHT, RAINER, *Francisco Suárez. Über die Individualität und des Individuationsprinzip.* Hamburg: Meiner, 1976, 2 vol.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Aspects 'cartésiens' de la théorie suarezienne de la matière," in *Lire Descartes aujourd'hui*, ed. Olivier Depré, Danielle Lories, Louvain-la-Neuve/Louvain, Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie/Peeters, 1997, pp. 21-45.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Autoritätsargument und Erfahrungsargument in 17 Jahrhundert." In *Entwicklung der Methodenlehre in Rechtswissenschaft und Philosophie vom 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zu einem interdisziplinären Symposion in Tübingen*, 19-20 april 1996. ed. Jan Schröder, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Del corpuscularismo de Suárez," in *Historia y pensamiento. Homenaje a D.L. del Corral*, ed. M. C. Iglesias, Madrid, vol. II (1987), pp. 457-476.
SPECHT, RAINER, "El sentido del llamado voluntarismo en Suárez," *Revista de Estudios Politicos*, 144 (1965), pp. 143-151.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Francisco Suárez über den Krieg," in Norbert Brieskorn / Markus Riedenauer (ed.), *Suche nach Frieden: Politische Ethik in der Frühen Neuzeit*, vol. I, Stuttgart., 2000.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Über den Stil der *Disputationes metaphysicae* von Franciscus Suárez," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 13/3 (1988), pp. 23-35.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Über die Körperlehre in Suárez' *Disputationes metaphysicae*," in *Mathesis rationis. Festschrift für H. Schepers*, ed. A. Heinekamp, W. Lenzen, M. Schneider, Münster (1990), pp. 207-222.
SPECHT, RAINER, "Zur Bezeichnung unzureichender Zweitursachen bei Francisco Suárez," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 68 (1959), pp. 382-392.

SPECHT, RAINER, "Zur Kontroverse von Suárez und Vazquez über den Grund der Verbindlichkeit des Naturrechts," *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie* 45 (1959), pp. 235-255.
STEGMÜLLER, FRIEDRICH, *Zur Gnadenlehre des jungen Suárez*, Freiburg 1933.
STEGMÜLLER, FRIEDRICH, "Eine ungedruckte Denkschrift des P. Suárez S. J.",*Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 6 (1937), pp. 58-82.
STEGMÜLLER, FRIEDRICH, "Zwei Autographen des Suárez über seine Lehrdifferenzen mit Ludwig Molina," *Römische Quarta1schrift* 42 (1934), pp. 333-339.
STENGREN, G. L., *Human Intellectual Knowledge of the Material Singular According to Francis Suárez*, New York, 1965.
SUAREZ, PIERRE-FRANÇOIS, "La pensée de Suárez conçue comme système," *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofia* 7 (1980), pp. 179-190.
TAVARES, S., "Na materia da extensão, Suárez é tomista ou 'suareziano'?" *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* (Burgos 1949), I, pp. 361-371.
TEIXEIRA, ANTÓNIO BRAZ, "Suárez e o objecto e a natureza da metafísica," Adelino Cardoso et al. (eds.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), Tradição de modernidade*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri & Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 1999, pp. 21-36.
TEIXIDOR, LUIS, "El concepto de bondad o malicia moral," *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 13 (1934) 111-154.
TEIXIDOR, LUIS, "Suárez, el filósofo español," *El Correo Catalán* 2 marzo (1917), p. 115.
TEIXIDOR, LUIS, "Suárez y Santo Tomás. Notas críticas." *Estudios eclesiásticos* 12 (1933), pp. 75-99; pp. 199-227; 13 (1934), pp. 111-154; pp. 262-286; (15), pp. 67-82.
TEJADA, F. E., "Suárez y el pensamiento inglés contemporáneo," *Acta Salmanticensia* 1 (1948), pp. 27-43.
THIEMME, H., "Natürliches Privatrecht und Spätscholastik," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 1953, pp. 230-266.
THOMPSON, AUGUSTINE, O. P., "Francis Suárez's Theory of Analogy and the Metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Angelicum* 72-3 (1995), pp. 353-362.
TOLEDANO, ANDRÉ D., "La conception de la souveraineté dans la philosophie politique de Francisco Suárez," *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofia, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 293-300.
TRAGELLA, G., "La psicología del P. Suárez," *Revista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 10 (1918), pp. 127-140.
TRELOAR, JOHN L., "Moral Virtue and the Demise of Prudence in the Thought of Francis Suárez," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65 (1991), pp. 387-405.

TRUYOL Y SERRA, A.,"El objetivismo ético de Francisco Suárez y su significación en la historia del pensamiento," *Actas del IV Centenario de Francisco Suárez* (Burgos 1949), II, pp. 197-209.
TUSQUETS, JUAN, "François Suárez. Sa metaphysique et sa criteriologie," *Apports hispaniques à la Philosophie chrétienne de I'Occident*. Louvain-Paris: Publications Universitaires, 1962, pp. 73-116.
UBIN, VINCENT, "Suárez," in *Dictionnaire d'éthique et de philosophie morale*, ed. M. Canto-Sperber, Paris, PUF, 1996, pp. 1472-1476.
UGARTE DE ERCILLA, E., "El 'Exímio Doctor' y los críticos modernos," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 1 (1922)m pp. 98-112; 2 (1923), pp. 60-78.
URMENETA, F., *Nuevos ensayos de crítica filosófica*. Barcelona, 1953.
URTIAGA, A.M., "Semblanza de Suárez," *Razón y Fe* 138 (1948), pp. 17-23.
USCATESCU BARRON, J., "El concepto de metafísica en Suárez: su objeto y dominio," *Pensamiento* 51 (1995), pp. 215-236.
VARGAS-MACHUCA, ANTONIO, *Escritura, tradición e Iglesia como reglas de fe, según Francisco Suárez*, Granada, Biblioteca Teologica Granadina, 1967.
VILAR, JUAN, "La teologia liturgica del 'Doctor Exímio' Francisco Suárez S.I.," *Razon y Fe* 55 (1919), pp. 37-43 ; 313-324.
VINCENT, ANDRÉ, "La notion moderne de droit naturel et le volontarisme. De Suárez à Rousseau," *Archives de philosophie du droit*, 1963.
VLEERSCHAUWER, HERMANN J. DE, "Un paralelo protestante a la obra de Suárez," Revista de Filosofía," Madrid 8: 1949, pp. 365-400.
VILLEY, MICHEL, "Remarque sur la notion de droit chez Suárez," *Archives de philosophie* 42 (1979), pp. 219-227.
VOLLERT, C., *Suárez: On the Various Kinds of Distinctions*. Milwaukee Wisconsin: Marquette University Press 1947. Second printing 1976.
VOLPI, FRANCO, "Suárez et le problème de la métaphysique," *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 98 (1993), 395-411.
VOS, A. F. DE, "El Aristotelismo de Suárez y su teoría de la individuación," *Revista de Filosofia* (Madrid), 7 (1948, número extraordinario), pp. 755-765.
VOS, A.F. DE, "L'aristotélisme de Suárez, et sa théorie de l'individuation", *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 505-514.
VRIES, J. DE., "Die Erkenntnislehre des F. Suárez und der Nominalismus," *Skolastik* 3 (1949), pp. 321-349.
WALTHER, MANFRED D., "*Potestas multitudinis* bei Suárez und *potentia multitudinis* bei Spinoza. Zur Transformation der Demokratietheorie zu Beginn der Neuzeit," in *Die Ordnung der Praxis. Neue Studien zur spanischen Spätscholastik*, ed. Frank Grunert / Kurt Seelmann (Tübingen, 2001), 281-298.

WELLS, NORMAN J., "Descartes and Suárez on Secondary Qualities. A Tale of Two Readings," *The Review of Metaphysics* 51-3 (1998), pp. 565-604.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Descartes' *Idea* and its Sources," *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67-4 (1993), pp. 513-535.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "*Esse cognitum* and Suárez Revisited," *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67 -3 (1993), pp. 339-348.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Javelli and Suárez on the Eternal Truths," *The Modern Schoolman* 72 (1994), pp. 13-35.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Material Falsity in Descartes, Arnauld, and Suárez," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 22 (1984), pp. 25-50.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Objective Being: Descartes and his Sources," *The Modern Schoolman* 45 (1967), pp. 49-61.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Objective Reality of Ideas in Arnauld, Descartes and Suárez," in E. J. KREMER (ed), *The Great Arnauld and Some of His Philosophical Correspondents*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Objective Reality of Ideas in Descartes, Caterus and Suárez," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 28-1 (1990), pp. 33-61.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Suárez and a Salamancan Thomist: A Tale of a Text," in *Hispanic Philosophy in the Age of Discovery*, ed. Kevin White, Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1997, pp. 201-225.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Suárez, Historian and Critic of the Modal Distinction between Essential Being and Existential Being," *The New Scholasticism* 36 (1962), pp. 419-444.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Suárez on Eternal Truths," *The Modern Schoolman* 58 (1981), pp. 73-104.; "Suárez on Eternal Truths. Part II, " *The Modern Schoolman* 58 (1981), pp. 159-174.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "Suárez on Material Falsity," in S. F. BROWN (edit.), *Meeting of the Minds. The Relations Between Medieval and Classical Modern European Philosophy*, Rencontres de Philosophie Médiévale, 7. Brepols, 1998, pp. 1-26.
WELLS, NORMAN J., "The Number of Terms in the Suarezian Discussion on Essence and Being," *The Modern Schoolman* 34 (1957), pp. 147-191.
WERNER, CARL, *Franz Suárez und die Scholastik der letzten Jahrhunderte*. Regensburg, 1889.
WILENIUS, REIJO, *The Social and Political Theory of Francisco Suárez*. Helsinki 1963.
YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO, "El ente de razón en Suárez," *Pensamiento* 4 (1948, número extraordinario), pp. 271-303.
YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO, "El tema de la verdad en la metafísica de Suárez," *Revista de Filosofia*, Madrid, 7 (1948, *número extraordinario*), pp. 659-692.

YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO, "Espacio y tiempo en Suárez," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, II (1949), pp. 145-182.

YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO, "La metafísica de Francisco Suárez," *Revista Nacional de Educación* 3 (1943), pp 29-62.

YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO "La verdad en la metafísica de Suárez," *Revista de filosofía* (1948), pp. 659-692.

YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO, "Modo y límite en Suárez," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, III (1949), pp. 533-546.

YELA UTRILLA, JUAN FRANCISCO, "Suárez y la unidad de la filosofía," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Filosofía, Barcelona, 4-10 Octubre 1948, con motivo del Centenario de los filósofos Francisco Suárez y Jaime Balmes*, Madrid, Instituto "Luis Vives" de Filosofía, I (1949), pp. 157-196.

ZAFFARONI, J. C., "La materia prima en Suárez," *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimieinto de Francisco Suárez* (Burgos 1949) I, pp. 291-306.

ZARAGÜETA Y BENGOECHEA, JUAN, *La filosofía de Suárez y el pensamiento actual*. Granada, Imprenta H° de Paulino Ventura, 1941.

ZARAGÜETA Y BENGOECHEA, JUAN, "El problema del ser en la metafísica de Suárez," *Boletín de la Univesidad de Granada* 13 (1941), pp. 59-81.

ZARAGÜETA Y BENGOECHEA, JUAN,"La teoría suareciana de la causalidad," *Boletin de la Universidad de Granada*, 13 (1941), pp. 173-193.

ZUBIMENDI MARTINEZ, J., "La teoría de las distinciones de Suárez y Descartes," *Pensamiento*, 40 (1984), pp. 179-202.

ZULUETA, A., "Manuscritos de Francisco Suárez em Portugal", *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofía* 3 (1947), pp. 390-399.

NAME INDEX

Adam of St. Victor, 167n.
Adams, John, 12
Aegidius Romanus, *Doctor Fundatissimus*, 14, 49, 51, 54
Albertus Magnus, *Doctor Universalis*, 42
Alexander of Hales, *Doctor Irrefragabilis*, 45, 46, 50
Alexander VII, pope, 12
Alexandre, Noel, 56
Álvares, Baltasar, 51
Ambrosino, Giovanni, 55
Amico, Franciscus, 56
Andrés de la Madre de Dios, 63
Anselm, of Canterbury, *Doctor Magnificus*, 14, 41
Antoine, Paul-Gabriel, 58
Antonio de Aragon, 42
Antonio de la Madre de Dios, 60, 62, 63, 169, 169n, 193
Antonio de S. Juan Bautista, 63
Antonio del Santísimo Sacramento, 63
Apusius, Laurentius Bernardus a S. Petro, 58
Aquinas, Thomas, *Doctor Angelicus, vel Communis*, 16, 33, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 60, 103, 113, 117, 128, 143, 144, 145, 155, 164, 165, 167, 171, 182, 186, 215, 268, 282, 305
Araújo, Francisco de, 42, 49
Aristotle, 10, 13, 27, 33, 41, 42, 43, 51 52, 126, 143, 145, 177, 179, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 215, 216, 278,
Arriaga, Roderigo de, 60, 62
Ascuto, Felix Gabriel de, 50
Aubenque, Pierre, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 137, 178
Augustine, 41, 50, 182, 215, 237
Aureolus, Petrus, 201, 268, 268n
Averroes/Ibn Rushd, 42
Aversa, Raffaelle, 62
Avicenna/Ibn Sina, 42

Babenstuber, Ludovicus, 55
Bacon, Francis, 180, 188, 192
Bacon, Roger, 42, 192
Baconthorp, John, *Doctor Resolutus*, 60
Bailly, Louis, 58
Bañez, Domingo, 49, 84, 143, 149
Baro, Bonaventura, 55
Barth, Karl, 99
Bartholomeus Durandus, 57
Baudunio, Marcus de, 18, 50, 61, 64
Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb, 274, 283
Becanus, Martinus, 54, 56
Bellarmine, Robert, 61 64, 93
Bellutus, Bonaventura, 63
Benedict XIV, pope, 12, 23, 24n
Benedictis, Joannes Baptista de, 55
Berkeley, George, 34, 186, 190, 223, 296, 297n
Bernard, of Clairvaux, *Doctor Mellifluus*, 14, 15, 41, 49, 51, 54, 58, 63
Bernardo de Bologna, 63
Berti, Gianlorenzo, 15, 54, 57
Bérulle, Pierre de, 180
Biacenses, 61
Billuart, Charles-René, 17, 54, 57, 169
Blaise de la Conception, 62
Blasco, Dionisio, 64
Boethius, 42
Bonaventura Lingonensis, 50
Bonaventure, *Doctor Seraphicus*, 14, 16, 40, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 55, 57, 60, 63, 64, 153
Bonerba, Raffaelle, 51
Bontempus, Gaudentius, 17, 54, 57
Bosco, Joannes, 57
Bossuet, Jacques-Bénigne, 206
Boyvin, Jean Gabriel, 63
Brancatus a Lauria, Laurentius, 44, 45

Brentano, Franz, 187
Brulifer, Etienne, 44
Bultmann, Rudolf, 99
Burgerdijck, Franco, Francis, 188
Burghoff, Albericus, 14, 54, 58

Cajetan/ Thomas de Vio, 42, 48, 49, 101, 108, 113, 134, 143, 149, 150, 153, 155, 164, 165, 166, 277
Canali, Benedetto Maria, 64
Cano, Melchior, 61, 64, 84
Capreolus, Joannes, 44, 200
Capuleus Cortonensis, 44
Carpenedulo, Marcus Antonius de, 55
Carroll, Charles, 12, 26, 93, 94
Cavellus, Hugo, 54, 55
Christina, queen, 180
Cisneros, Francisco Jiménez de, 82, 83
Clauberg, Johann Baptist, 137, 279
Claude Joseph de S. Florian, 55
Columbus, Bonaventura, 55
Complutenses, 60, 62
Compton-Carleton, Thomas, 62, 279, 281
Concina, Daniele, 57
Conimbricenses, 51, 52, 60, 179
Contenson, Vincent, 56
Copernicus, Nicolaus, 192
Coriolano, Francesco, 50
Coujou, Jean-Paul, 127, 128
Courtine, Jean-François, 109 126, 178
Couto, Sebastião do, 52
Crescas, 188
Cyril of Jerusalem, 39

D'Alembert, Jean, 61
Damascene, John, 167n
De Barberiis, Bartholomaeus, 64
Descartes, René, 11, 12, 19, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 98, 100, 101, 105, 126, 127, 137, 171, 173, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 242, 244, 245, 246, 249, 252, 253, 256, 257, 259, 260, 277, 282, 283
Deussen, Paul, 293
Diderot, Denis, 61
Dionysius, "the Areopagite," 41
Domingo de Santa Teresa, 63
Dupasquier, Sebastien, 63
Durandus, 268

Emmericus a Sancto Stephano, 55
Eustachius a Sancto Paulo, 62

Faber, Philippus, 45
Fabro, Cornelio, 142, 165, 166, 283
Feijóo, Benito Geronimo, 194
Ferrari, Giuseppe Antonio, 64
Filmer, Robert, 93
Fonseca, Pedro da, 52, 61, 100 101, 103, 179, 188
Francisco de Jesús Maria, 63
François-Marie de Bruxelles, 57
Frassen, Claude, 16, 17, 43, 61, 63

Galilei, Galileo, 180, 192
Garrigou-Lagrange, Reginald, 143
Gassendi, Pierre, 180, 236
Gavardi, Federico Nicola, 15, 54, 57
Geach, Peter, 166
Geiger, Louis-Bertrand, 166
Generation of 80, 97, 98, 103, 106
Georgius de Rhodes, 62
Gerbert, Martin, 58
Geulincx, Arnold, 236
Gilson, Étienne, 10, 15, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 112, 114, 118, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129,

137, 143, 149, 150, 155, 164, 165, 166, 273
Glisson, Francis, 34, 181, 182, 189, 223, 297,298
Goclenius, Rudolf, 279
Godoy, Pedro, 56
Gois, Manuel de, 51, 52
Gonet, Jean-Baptiste, 54, 56, 169
Gosselin, Roland, 165
Gotti, Vincenzo, 57
Goudin, Antoine, 17, 54, 55
Gouveia, Francisco Velasco de, 26, 92
Gredt, Joseph, 149, 150, 154, 160, 165
Gregory of Nyssa, 39
Grosseteste, Robert, 42
Grotius, Hugo, 21, 26, 91, 93, 189

Hamilton, Alexander, 12
Harvey, William, 180
Hauzeur, Matthias, 50
Heereboord, Adrian, 12, 188
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm, 175, 176, 177, 186, 190, 215, 226, 286, 287, 289, 290
Heidegger, Martin, 99, 126, 127, 128, 134, 177, 178, 187, 287, 288
Hellin, José, 29, 67, 106, 126, 148, 157, 218n, 247n, 287
Helmont, Franciscus Mercurius, 266
Henno, Franciscus, 17, 54, 57
Henry of Ghent, *Doctor Solemnis*, 14, 54
Herincx, Guillaume, 157
Hermann, Amand, 63
Hidalgo y Costilla, Miguel, 26, 92
Hieronymus de Montefortino, 50
Hobbes, Thomas, 11, 180, 188, 295, 296
Holtzclau, Thomas, 56
Hugh of St. Victor, 40
Hume, David, 34, 190, 224, 273, 308, 309
Hurtado de Mendoza, Pedro, 54, 55, 188, 189
Husserl, Edmund, 126, 187

Ildefonso de los Angeles, 60, 63
Illuminato de Oddo, 55
Isabel la Católica, queen, 11, 19, 25, 67, 82, 83
Izquierdo, Sebastián, 279, 281

James I, king, 92
Jaspers, Karl, 99
Javelli, Giovanni Crisostomo, 14, 51
Jefferson, Thomas, 12, 26, 92, 93, 94, 95
Jerome Gadius, 42
Joannes Minerius, 42
John of St. Thomas, Joannes a Sancto Thoma, João de S. Tomas, *Doctor Profundus*, 18, 46, 62, 141, 142, 143, 144, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160,161, 163, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 257, 277, 278, 281, 285
John Paul II, pope, 22, 23n
Juan de la Anunciación, 60, 63
Juan de los Santos, 62

Kant, Immanuel, 105, 132, 133, 166, 174, 175, 176, 177, 187, 190, 215, 230, 257, 258, 273, 274, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291
Keckermann, Bartholomaeus, 279
Kierkegaard, Soren, 279
Kilber, Henricus, 56
Krisper, Crescentius, 18, 61, 63

Labat, Pierre, 56
Las Casas, Bartolomé de, 25, 82, 83, 84
Leibniz, Gottfried, 11, 31, 34, 128, 131, 176, 183, 184, 185, 186, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 227, 239,

249, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 272, 273, 276, 277, 278, 279, 283, 287
Leo XIII, pope, 103
Leonardo da Vinci, 192
Lessius, Leonardus, 65
Locke, John, 26, 34, 92, 93, 94, 181, 183, 186, 189, 190, 221, 223, 260, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308
Lombard, Peter, *Magister Sententiarum*, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 143
Lossada, Luis de, 55, 280
Lugo, Juan de, 61, 65
Luis de León, 84
Lychetus, Franciscus, 45

Macedo, Francisco, 50
MacIntyre, Alasdair, 177n, 178
Madhva, 291
Magalhães, Cosme de, 51
Maier, Friedrich, 290
Maimonides, 188
Malebranche, Nicolas de, 182, 183, 206, 216, 225, 226, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 258, 260, 270, 283
Mancio de Corpus Christi, 84
Marcel, Gabriel, 99
Marcellus Rhegiensis, 17, 57
Maréchal, Joseph, 143, 166
Marín, Juan, 56
Marion, Jean-Luc, 126, 127, 137, 178
Mastrius de Meldula, Bartholomaeus, 63
Mauricio de Portu, 42
Maurus, Sylvester, 62
Mayr, Antoninus, 62
Mayronnes, François, 216
Medina, Bartolomé de, 64, 84
Mersenne, Marin, 180
Mezger, Paul, 57
Miguel de la Santísima Trindad, 62
Mill, John Stuart, 12
Molina, Luis de, 61, 64, 84
Montaigne, Michel de, 191
Montesquieu, Charles, 26, 92

Navarro, Joaquín, 51
Neubauer, Ignaz, 56
Newton, Isaac, 183, 192
Niccolò di S. Giovanni Battista, 56
Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm, 175, 176, 186, 190, 226, 287, 290, 293
Noel, François, 56

Ockham, William of, *Magister Incomparabilis, Venerabilis Inceptor, Doctor Invincibilis*, 152, 153, 176, 201, 216
Olpensis, Hyacinthus, 56
Origen, 39
Ortega y Gasset, José, 99

Panger, Marinus, 45, 57
Parmenides, 117,126, 287
Paul V, pope, 12
Pedro de Córdoba, 25, 82, 83
Peñafiel, Alfonso, 55
Peter of Spain, Petrus Hispanus/ John XXI, pope, 144, 184
Peynado, Ignacio, 279
Philippus a S. Trinitate, 56
Piny, Alexandre, 56
Pius XII, pope, 12
Platelius, Jacobus, 56
Plato, 41, 51, 188, 290
Poncius, Joannes/ Punch, John, 63
Porphyry, 144
Pufendorf, Samuel, 93, 189

Quirós, Antonio Bernaldo de, 55, 279, 280

Ramirez, Santiago, 164
Rhegiensis, Marcellus, 57

Ripalda, Juan Martinez de, 62, 65
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 26, 81, 92, 93, 181
Rubeus de Lugo, 55
Rubios, Juan de Palácios, 82
Ruiz de Montoya, Diego, 61, 65
Rutherford, Samuel, 93

Saenz de Aguirre, José, 14, 54, 58
Salmanticenses, 51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 143, 169
Sanches, Francisco, 191
Sanchez, Tomás, 61, 65
Sannig, Bernardus. 57
Sayve, Bernardus de, 51
Scheibler, Christoph, 279
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 175, 176, 186, 190, 215, 226, 290, 291, 292, 293
Scotus, John Duns, *Doctor Subtilis*, 14, 16, 17, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 60, 63, 177, 182, 184, 221, 274
Sebastián de S. Joaquín, 63, 279, 281
Semery, André, 279, 280n
Sepúlveda, Juan de, 82, 84n
Sfondrati, Coelestinus, 62
Siewerth, Gustav, 178
Simonet, Edmond, 58
Solorzano Pereira, Juan de, 82
Soto, Domingo de, 64, 277
Spinoza, Baruch, Benedict, Bento, 33, 34, 105, 181, 186, 188, 189, 216, 217, 222, 225, 226, 227, 237, 238, 239, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252,253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 260, 273, 283, 287
Stahl, Daniel, 279
Suárez, Francisco, *Doctor Eximius*, *passim*
Sylvester of Ferrara/ Ferrariensis, 48, 49, 62, 108
Sylvius, Franciscus, 50

Tanner, Adamus, 56, 179, 203
Tartaret, Pierre, 42
Tedeschi, Niccolò Maria, 58
Theodoret, 39
Tillich, Paul, 99
Timpler, Clemens, 188, 278, 279
Toledo, Francisco de/Toletus, Franciscus, 49, 179
Toledo, García de, 82
Tommaso d'Aquino della Natività, 63
Tournely, Honoré de, 54, 58
Trigosus, Petrus, 50

Ulloa, Juan de, 56, 279, 280

Valencia, Gregorio de, 49, 149
Van Steenberghen, Fernand, 160
Vázquez, Gabriel, 49, 143, 161, 162, 163
Vico, Giambattista, 184, 185
Vieira, António, 54
Villaroig, Juan Facundo, 57
Vitoria, Francisco de, 21, 25, 61, 64, 84, 91
Vulpes, Angelus, 50
Vurilongus, Guillaume, 44

Washington, George, 12
Wiest, Stephanus, 58
Wietrowski, Maximilian, 279, 281, 282
William of Moerbeke, 42
Wirceburgenses, 54, 56
Wolff, Christian, 11, 105, 121, 131, 132, 176, 185, 190, 225, 273, 274, 275, 276, 282, 291

Zacchaeus, Gilbert, 188
Zumel, Francisco, 49, 50

SUBJECT INDEX

Abstraction, stages of
from individuality of matter but retaining its sensory specificity: in physics, 197
from specificity of matter but retaining its intelligibility: in mathematics, 197
from matter as such, sensible or intelligible: in metaphysics, 197

Analogy
coheres with multiple concept/concepts of being (classical Thomism), 151, 155
coheres with unitary concept of being (Suárez), 69, 73, 116, 118, 134, 166
in Aquinas; both of attribution and proportionality accepted, 155, 164
in Berkeley, 34, 186, 305
in John of St. Thomas, resolute adherence to proportionality, 165
of classical Thomism, metaphorical and extrinsic, 134
of proportionality, made orthodox by Cajetan in classical Thomism till early 20th century, 164
pertains to the very structure of being, 135
Suarezian, of attribution, 71, 73, 75 76, 118, 148n. 164
Suarezian, accepted by some Thomists, 164
Suarezian, described by representationalists as univocity, 118, 134, 135, 141
Thomist analogy dubious, unity of concept of being is certain, 134
Thomist/Cajetanian, of proportionality, 134, 136, 154, 155

Anamorphosis of Suárez
anamorphosis, the distorted appearing as the regular, 28
anamorphosis of Suárez's concepts, the material for systems alien to the Suarezian,199
anamorphosis of Suárez's existentialism an important source of modern philosophy, 226
anamorphosis of Suárez's terms, the foundation of modern philosophy, 28, 35 98, 178, 199
anamorphosis of Suárez's thought leading to the collapse of metaphysics, 175
anamorphosis of Suárez's thought, more a Rationalist event than an Empirical one, 34
by Hobbes, 296
by Schopenhauer, 293
by the Empiricists, of the concept of substance and accidents, 34, 223, 224
by the post-Gilsonian representationalists, 128
completed by the later Rationalists, 226, 276, 293, 296,
in three stages: Cartesian, Kantian & Hegelian, 175
uncannily foreseen by Suárez, 34

Angelism of Descartes: angelic and human intellect & cognition
adequate object of dubious intelligibility, for Kant, 284
adequate object of metaphysics, real being, 195, 276, 281
adequate object of the intellect, includes the possible and impossible, 281
adequate object, angel and human: being in its entire latitude, 195
all entity is intelligible, encompassing the thinkable, represent-

able, and the supratranscendental, 136, 195
angelic knowledge: intuitive in its mode, innate in origin, and independent of things, 227
disembodied or angelic intelligence, 200
human and angelic intellects and cognitions compared, 204, 209, 227
human intellect isolated from the senses by Descartes, 210
human intellect replaced by the angelic by Descartes, 198
human intellect's connection with the senses reduces the disproportion between matter and spirit, 33,
human intellect's inability to eliminate lack of certitude, 200
human intellect's powers less than angelic, 195
human intellect's two aspects, active (*intellectus agens*) and passive (*intellectus possibilis*), 196
human knowledge affected by the senses only in the circumstances of experience, 228
human knowledge attained chiefly through vision in God (Malebranche), 241, 247
human knowledge begins with the senses, according to the Scholastics, 191
object of human intelligence, for Kant, 285
objects of human intelligence, adequate and proportionate, 195
proportionate object of the human intellect, material reality, 195, 196, 286
proportionate object restored, though phenomenalized, by Kant, 285, 286
quasi-angelic Cartesian man, 200, the Apostate Angel, 200
reason able by its power to confirm the natural principles which encompass all things, 25, 136, 195
shortcomings of the human intellect, 200
singulars: how known to the human mind, 70
three types of intellectual cognition: divine, angelic & human, 209, 283

Angelism of Descartes, launches modern philosophy, 176, 192, 202, 211

Animalization of human mind by Empiricists, 283

Anti-metaphysical philosophies, post-Hegelian, 175, 176
Nietzsche: inversion of metaphysics, 176
Schopenhauer: perversion of metaphysics, 176

Apollo & Dionysus: two poles of Primordial Unity
Apollo, measured, rational and restrained, stands for the multiplicity pole, Phenomena, transfiguring genius of the *principium individuationis*, 293
Apollonian experience multiple, manifestations of the Will-to-Power, appearances through which the original Unity is redeemed, 293
Dionysus, impulsive, instinctive, and irrational, stands for the unity pole, Primordial Unity, 293
Dionysian experience, intoxicating, unified, centered on the Will

to Power, penetrating into the innermost core of things, redeeming the *principium individuationis*, 293

Aristotelianism: deficiencies (marked by the Scientific Revolution) canonical authority conferred on Aristotle's oeuvre, 192
flawed collection of data, 192
rejection of experiment, 192

Being and existence in classical Thomism. See also Being and Existence in Suárez
Aquinas, alleged to have discovered the meaning of existence, 103, 105
Aristotelian Unmoved Mover, 251
Cajetan's equivalent of aptitudinal existence: *existentia ut significata*. 113.
double sense of being, essentialist (Cajetanian) and existentialist (Bañezian), 149
multiple concept of being (John of St. Thomas), 151, 152, 153
nominal and participial senses of being: in Cajetan, Sylvester & Fonseca, 108
relative nonbeing, 116, 117
two categories of Being, common (*ens commune*) and absolute, 116, 117

Being and existence in Empiricism. See also Being and Existence in Suárez
analogy in Berkeley (echoes of Suárez), 186, 223, 305
being, basic category of metaphysics (Berkeley), 302
essence: its double meaning according to Locke (and Suárez), 303, 304
existence and subsistence, distinguished by Suárez (Berkeley), 34, 223, 303, 304
precisive abstraction equivalent to metaphysical distinction of Suárez (Berkeley), 303
universality of the notion of existence (Hume), 309

Being and existence in Rationalism. See also Hegelianism ; Kantianism
being and non-being, object of metaphysics (Timpler), 278
being evokes non-being (Hegel), 287, 290
being, in Hegel and Suárez, immediate and indeterminate, 289, 290
non-being and becoming, in Hegel, 287, 289, 290
primacy of thought and consciousness over being, 137, 139, 151, 260
real and fictional being (*ens in quantum cognitum*), object of metaphysics, 137
the Absolute, a substance encompassing its modes (Hegel), 287

Being and existence in Suárez. See also The Trichotomy 1, 2, 3; Formal Concept; Objective Concept; Intra-mental Phenomenon
aptitudinal or precisive existence. See The Trichotomy 1, 2, 3
being equated with existence, 101, 106
being, unitary dyad, 69, 106, 108, 109, 111, 116, 117, 129, 130
conditions of existence, 99
essence as we know it and as it is in itself, 303. Similar concept in Locke, 303

essentia realis, equivalent to aptitudinal existence, 114
existence a predicate only in the necessary being, 133
existence always singular, 68, 69, 70, 102
existence both a perfection and a limiter of perfection, 117
existence the perfection of perfections, 102
existentiality, see below
imperfect precision of being as such from its particulars, 148, 155
intra-mental consciousness more accessible to us than extra-mental reality, 174, 175, 202, 259
intra-mental criterion for discerning extra-mental reality, 31, 138, 139, 174, 202
no real distinction between essence and existence, 72, 123, 150
nominal and participial being reduced to one concept with two degrees of abstraction, 109, 111
omniconceptualism, 30, 31, 173, 200, 201
preeminence, primacy of existence; its precedence over essence; existentiality, 69, 72, 98, 100, 102, 119, 129, 137, 149, 150, 259, 288
preeminence, primacy of thought or consciousness over being, 137, 139, 151, 260
primacy of being, through its autonomy with regard to theology, 288
primacy of existence, 69, 72, 98, 100, 102, 119, 129, 137, 149, 150, 259
real (*ens in quantum reale*), notional or fictional being, object of metaphysics (Supertranscendentalists), 276, 277
Suarezian system, four themes: existence, inclusiveness, being, divinity, 68
trichotomous notion of existence: actual, aptitudinal/precisive, potential, 106
unity of being, 75, 134, 138, 151, 259

Being and existence in Wolff
being not equivalent to possibility (Wolff), 274
dyadic being of Suárez compared to Wolff's monadic being, 276
existence defined as the complement to possibility and as actuality, 275
non-repugnant vs. possible being, 274
triad of meanings of being – possibility, aptitude for existence, actual existence, 275

Bipolar reality: unity and multiplicity; problem of the One & the Many. See also
Apollo and Dionysus: two Poles of Primordial Unity
undifferenced unity (identified with the thing-in-itself) and differentiated plurality (Schopenhauer), 291
unity pole connected with Bacchus and differenced pole with Apollo (Nietzsche), 293.

Bonaventurianism 15, 16, 17, 18, 44, 50, 54, 55, 57, 61, 64

Cartesianism, 182, 222, 230, 236
See also Dualism, Cartesian
its inability to explain the lack of interaction between mind and

body led Cartesians to occasionalism, 236
model of a closely knit and systematically developed philosophy, 244

Cartesianism vs. Malebranchianism
self, primary object of thought (Descartes), 240
soul not sufficient in itself as thinking substance (Malebranche), 240

Catholic Dis-Enlightenment: its representatives, 11, 67, 82. See also Enlightenment, the Catholic; Enlightenments: the Catholic and Secular

Certainty, criteria for, in Descartes, 31, 202
attained through a discontinuous succession of intuitions, 207
cogito: basis of certainty, 203
method in attainment of: intuition and deduction, 207
proved by the existence of doubt itself, 193
terms for describing such criteria: especially clarity and distinctness, 204, 231, 234
through elimination of demonic deception, 31, 208
through simplicity, incomposite, 204, 205

Certainty, criteria for, in Suárez, 31, 202
simplicity, composite, 204
terms for describing such criteria, 202
through elimination of demonic deception, 31, 208

Cogitabilitas, 31, 128, 225, 260, 276, 278
equivalent to *cognoscibilitas* of John of St. Thomas, 278
identification of actual existence with possibility and with essence, 127
identification of being with possibility, 121
identification with reality as such, 128, 260, 276
identification with representability, attributed to Suárez, 128; and to Kant, 132, 133
object of metaphysics, according to Leibniz, 31

Complete philosophical and theological courses, collective projects
Biacenses, 61
Complutenses, 60, 62
Conimbricenses, 51, 52, 60, 179
Salmanticenses, dogmatic, 51, 60, 61, 143, 169
Salmanticenses, moral, 60, 63
Wirceburgenses, 54, 56

Critics of Thomism: Augustinians, Scotists, Nominalists, Suárez, 142

Disproportion between matter and spirit renders angelic knowledge of material reality impossible, 32, 33, 182, 196, 210, 218, 219

Distinctions, Suarezian theory of conceptual, metaphysical, distinction of reason with a basis in reality (*distinctio rationis cum fundamento in re*), of reasoned reason (*rationis ratiocinatae*) 32, 70 71, 72, 145, 213, 214, 245, 305;

prevents the reification of concepts, 72
major real distinction, 212, 231
minor real or modal distinction, 32, 212, 239, 245
three types of distinction: major real, minor real (modal) & conceptual 32, 211, 212, 213; in Suárez, 32, 212; in Descartes, 231, 242; in Spinoza, 245
verbal, of reasoning reason (*rationis ratiocinantis*)., 71

Divine nature in Suarezianism and Thomism, 166, 167, 168, 170
and the Trinity, in John of St. Thomas, 170
and the Trinity, in Suárez, 167, 168
Suarezian definition of the Godhead, *ipsamet intellectio subsistens*, 167
Thomist definitionof the Godhead, *ipsum esse subsistens*, 166

Divinization of man by the Rationalists
elevation of the human mind to the angelic (Descartes), 256
elevation of human mind to vision in God (Malebranche), 258
elevation of human mind to identity with God (Spinoza), 258
re-humanization of man (Kant), 258

Dualism, Cartesian. See also Dualism, Malebranchian
anticipated critique of Cartesian dualism by Suárez, 236
body and soul form a unit, somehow (Descartes), 226
dualism demonstrated by the application of Descartes's criteria of certainty, 231
distinct perception of body and mind show that they are entirely distinct, 219
human person: composed of two mutually exclusive substances, extended (body) or unextended (spirit), 226, 230
indemonstrability of dualism, according to Descartes, 234
opposed to Scholasticism, which views man as unity, 230
syllogistic proof of distinction of mind and body, 232

Dualism, Malebranchian. See also Dualism, Cartesian
Malebranchian dualism more rigid than even that of Descartes, 239, 240
Malebranchian soul different from the Cartesian, 240
soul not united with the body but with God alone, 240

Dualities: complementarity with preeminence: actual and aptitudinal
existence; existence and essence; intellect and will; singular and universal, 72

Empiricists and Scholastic terminology
contrast of the simplicity of God and the complexity of the Scholastic language used to describe Him (Feijóo), 194
Hobbes's use of Scholastic vocabulary, 186, 295, 296,

Scholastic method efficacious for establishing truth and assailing error (Suárez), 295
Scholastic method tedious speculation for the Empiricists, 295
Scholastic terminology gibberish and meaningless for the Scholastics themselves (Hobbes), 180, 295, 296
Scholastic vocabulary a mysterious jargon (Berkeley), 296
Scholastic vocabulary affectedly obscure and unintelligible (Locke), 296

Empiricists and Suárez
centrality of experience in human knowledge (Locke), 223, 260
Empiricism expects no absolute certainty, 198
Empiricism views reality as a mass of phenomena accessible to sense experience, 199
Empiricism, mild form of Skepticism, 198
experience the foundation of all philosophy (Wolff), 271
ideas originate in sense-experience (Empiricists & Scholastics), 34, 261
impact of Suárez on Empiricists less powerful than on the Rationalists, 295
repudiation of innate ideas; sensation perfected by reflection (Locke and the Scholastics), 297
singularity in reality and universals in the mind (Suárez and Locke), 34
universals as just names, 295

Enlightenment, The Catholic
counterpoint with the Catholic Dis-Enlightenment, 31, 208
democracy, natural and pre-political, 19, 20, 21, 68, 87, 88, 90
energized by the Theologians of Salamanca, 11, 68, 84
focus on reason & freedom, particularly freedom, 19, 61, 80, 84
freedom, political, 20, 87,
freedom, religious, allowed only to non-apostate infidels, 19, 21, 84, 85
freedom, religious, proclaimed by Vatican II, 22
fulfiller of the Catholic Enlightenment: Suárez, 24, 25
initiator of the Catholic Enlightenment: Isabel la Católica, 11, 81, 83

Enlightenments: the Catholic and the Secular: focus on reason & freedom. See also The Catholic Enlightenment
Catholic Enlightenment, 11, 19, 24, 25, 68, 80, 82, 83, 84, 121, 189, 194, 278; its forerunner, Isabel la Católica, 83; its fulfiller, Suárez, 24, 25
Catholic Dis-Enlightenment, 11, 24, 25, 82
Secular Enlightenment, 19, 24, 25, 68, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84
French, 93
German, 121, 189, 275
Spanish, 194

Essence, double meaning of
In Locke: essence as nominal and real, 303
In Suárez: essence as we know it, and as it is in itself, 303

Essentialism, alleged, of Suárez: arguments of the representationalists

absolutization of essence, attributed to Suárez, 127
argument from the dual senses of being, the nominal and participial, 129, 130
argument from Suárez's alleged rejection of analogy, 134
argument from Suárez's double concept, the formal and the objective, 135
argument from the two senses of existence, the aptitudinal and potential, 131

Essentialism, alleged, of Suárez: Gilson's arguments
confusion of possible and aptitudinal existence, 120
portrayal of Suárez as an essentialist, 105, 106, 116, 118, 120
portrayal of Suárez as an existentialist, 118, 119, 120, 127
Suarezian univocity interpreted in a Thomist sense, 122, 123

Existence and existentialism. See also Being and Existence in Suárez; Being and Existence in Classical Thomism
Aquinas alleged discoverer of the true meaning of existence, 103, 105
Essentialism not characteristic of all modern philosophy and existentialism of all Scholastic philosophies, 100, 101
existentialism and Scholasticism, 97, 100
no identification of modern philosophy with essentialism and of Scholasticism with existentialism, 100, 101
nominal being restricted by the representationalists to essence, 129
non-Scholastic existentialism, existence devoid of essence, 99, 100
quoddity, word describing existence devoid of essence (Glisson) 182
Suarezianism an existentialism inclusive of essence, 101
Suarezianism best described as existential integralism, 101

Formal concept, 29, 30, 31, 74, 135, 137, 138, 200, 201, 259. See also Objective Concept
definition, significance, character, 29
extrinsic denomination from formal concept characterizes objective reality as objective concept, 30
formal concept does not only disclose things as they are, but fashion their content, 137
in Aureolus and Capreolus, 201
subjective state of mind criterion for establishing sense of objective reality, 27
to one formal concept there corresponds one objective concept, 138

Freedom movements, inspired by Suárez
directly: Portuguese, 25, 90, 92; and Mexican, 26. 90, 92
possibly indirectly: English, American and French, 90, 92, 93

Hegelianism. See also Being and Existence in Rationalism; Kantianism

Absolute, a substance encompassing its modes, 175, 287
being: the Absolute, infinite Reason, self-thinking Thought, 175, 287
being, rescued by Hegel from Kant's epistemological morass, 288
categories turn into their opposites, 287
Hegelian Unlimited equal to Kant's Unconditioned, 286
primacy of Being, affirmed by Suárez and Hegel, 288
rejection of Kant's predicaments, 215, 286

Heideggerian Minotaur, 178

Individuation
in Descartes: every existent entity self-individuated, 34, 220
in John of St. Thomas: entity individuated through its nature being circumstantiated by quantified matter, 146, 147
in Leibniz: every existent entity self-individuated, 34, 220, 266
in Suárez: every existent entity self-individuated, 34, 70, 146, 220, 264
individual reality: its common nature distinguished from its individuation conceptually only, 220, 266
no individuation by any non-essential principle, like quantified matter, 26

Innate ideas
connatural even to man (Descartes), 227
connatural to angels (Suárez), 209
describable as modes of the substance intelligence, 229, 241
ideas are not explicitly but only virtually innate, in that the mind has the power to find them in itself, 261
ideas derived from the mind itself, like the principle of contradiction, are innate, 261
ideas derived from sensation, as that sweet is not bitter, are not innate, 261
innate ideas, launch of modern philosophy, 211
innate ideas, not different from the thinking faculty (Descartes), 229
innate ideas: intra-mental category of the Cartesian system, 227
innate knowledge consists of dispositions or capacities, but not of clearly defined propositions, 260, 261
knowledge: product of the mind's activity on the data of experience, 261
not formally resolved into the notion of being, 229
originally referred only to the clear and distinct, but later all ideas, 228, 229
produced by the mind out of its own resources, 198, 226
provide a knowledge independent of sense experience, 242
ready-made in the mind, propositions with ideational content, independent of experience (Descartes), 260
theory of innate ideas, anticipates Kant's doctrine of a priori, 229, 230
There is nothing in the intellect which had not been in the senses

(Scholastics) – except the intellect itself (Leibniz), 261

Intellectual process, 284
from senses through abstraction, up to transcendence, in Scholasticism, 284
from transcendence down to phenomenal experience by Kant, 284

Interaction of mind (unextended) and body (extended) in Descartes
impossibility of the joining and intermingling of mind and matter (Gassendi), 236
joining and intermingling of the unextended and the extended (Descartes), 235
mind and body, mutually irreducible substances, cannot form unity, 234
no interaction possible between monads, but every desire to do so on part of each monad makes God intervene to produce what that creature wanted to do, 227
occasionalism adopted by Cartesians unsatisfied by Descartes's explanation, 236
possible explanation not of Descartes: as of angel united to robotic body (Suárez), 235

Interrelationship of concepts: composition and focusing
general Scholastic: by composition of generic and specific, 116
John of St. Thomas: explicitation of a less explicit but still multiple concept (in the case of being), 152
Suarezian: by conceptual focusing, *per maiorem expressionem*, 110, 116, 117, 118, 150, 156, 288, 289, 293 (*expressior conceptus*, 75, 110, 155, 156)
Suarezian conceptual focusing corroborated by example from optics, 110

Intra-mental concepts better known (*'notior'*) than extra-mental reality; *'notior,'*
the minuscule spark that ignited modern philosophy, 27, 138, 139, 174, 191, 201, 202, 259, 260

Intra-mental phenomenon
more accessible to us than extra-mental reality (*nobis notius, experientia notior*), 27, 138, 139, 174, 191, 201, 202, 259
Criterion to ascertain character of extra-mental reality, 31, 138, 139, 174, 202

Kantianism. See also *Cogitabilitas*; Innate Ideas; Hegelianism
consciousness the very beginning of speculative philosophy, 174
human mind conscious of itself only mediately, 257
innate ideas, a priori forms of Descartes and Kant, 230
Kant affirmed the unqualified preeminence of subjectivity over objectivity, 282
Kant restored humanity to man divinized by Descartes, Malebranche, Leibniz & Spinoza, 258, 283
Kant synthesizer of Rationalism and Empiricism, 174
Kant's list of predicaments questioned by Hegel and Schopenhauer, 215

Kant's unconditioned reality knowable through practical, not speculative, reason, 284
Kantian finite subjectivity replaced by Hegelian absolute subjectivity, 175
Kantian reality identical with the thinkable, 132
Kantian sensations equivalent to Scholasticism's material accidents, 285
Kantian thing-in-itself, enigmatic, inexplicable, unknowable, 282, 285; indemonstrable by Kant's principles, 175, 282, 285
Kantianism a stage in the collapse of metaphysics, along with Cartesianism & Hegelianism, 175
Scholastic process from sense to transcendence reversed by Kant, 284

Malebranche and the Scholastics
Malebranche investigated how an immaterial being (angel & human soul) could know material reality, 182
Malebranche professed to despise Scholasticism but was greatly influenced by Scholastic thought, 182
Malebranchian thought alien to the complexities of Scholasticism, 238

Mental phenomena, interest in, from the 14th century, 176

Metaphysics: acme and nadir
its rationale questioned by Nietzsche, 290
streamlining of metaphysics through a chain of definitions (Wolff), 276
systematized by Suárez as general and special, 28

Metaphysics, object of, as viewed by
the Supertranscendentalists
extrinsic knowability (Peynado), 279
the intelligible and the imaginable (Compton-Carleton), 281
the knowable (Ulloa), 280
the knowable and the imaginable (Quirós), 280
the possible and the impossible (Izquierdo, Semery & Wietrowski), 281

Modes. See also Predicaments, in Aristotle, Suárez and the Rationalists; Spinoza, Attributes; Spinoza, Basic Triad of Concepts; Substance and Modes, in Spinoza
cause more problems for Spinozism than they solve, 255
classification of modes: infinite & finite, immediate & mediate, 251
constituents of the monist god, described as *natura naturans* (substance) and *natura naturata* (modes), 253
definition of modes, as well as of attributes and substance, 244, 245
divine attributes, can be considered in their absolute nature or as affected by some mode, 248, 251
finite minds are modes of divine attribute of thought; finite bodies modes of divine extension, 248
modes not individuators of substance, 250
modes, affections of substance, infinite in number, only two known to us, thought and extension, 245 246, 248

modes, main prop, or corner stone, of Spinoza's system, 249
modes, signs of contingency and finitude in Suárez and of perfection in Spinoza, 244
necessity of modes not explained, 250
primary things: originate from some divine attribute, 251
Spinoza in his early career avoided affirming modes in God, 249
substance-mode binary worked out by Suárez replaces substance-accident binary of Aristotle, 33, 214

Monads, of Leibniz. See also, Substance in Leibniz; Pre-established Harmony of Leibniz
apperception defined, 267
appetition defined, 267
each monad changes when other monads change, 268
each monad evolves through its own inner law, 268
infinity of immaterial monads ultimate constituents of reality, 266
Leibnizian monad defined, 265
Leibnizian substance monadic, the Suarezian dyadic, 263
monad developed from Suarezian individuation, 221, 266
monadism reconciles final and mechanical causality, 268
monads arise through creation and perish through annihilation, 267
monads conspire in universal harmony. They only interact through pre-established harmony, 34, 267, 268
monads hierarchically organized culminate in dominant monad, 266
monads individually perfect, 222
monads not a chaotic agglomeration, 268
monads qualitatively distinguished by their internal qualities: perceptions, apperceptions and appetitions, 267
monads simple and compound, 265
monads, substances capable of action, virtually containing their attributes, 227
perception defined, 267; perception, degrees of, 267
simplicity of monads does not preclude a plurality of modifications, 266
substantial unifier, 265, 267
supreme monad God, 227
term 'monad' replaced term 'substantial form,' 266

Monist Vedanta, impact of
on Nietzsche, 293
on Schopenhauer (in addition to Plato and Kant), 290

Morality of the superman (Nietzsche), 290

Objective concept, 74, 135, 136, 150, 300. See Formal Concept; Metaphysics, Object of
character and significance, 30
corresponds to a single formal concept, 27, 259
definition, 29
distinction between formal and objective concept articulated from the 14th cent., and given its definitive form by Suárez, 201

established on the basis of ascertaining the nature of its corresponding formal concept, 299
heterogeneous content, 30, 174, not always positive but mainly extra-mental, 174; not favored by the supertranscendentalists, 136, 174
homogeneous content outlined by the supertranscendentalists and other late philosophers, 136, 174
not as well-known to us as the formal concept, 202
not really a concept, but termed such by extrinsic denomination to the formal concept, 136

Objective reality. See also Being and Existence in Suárez; Intramental Phenomenon
discerned through subjective phenomena, 27, 71, 201, 202
established only as objectively apparent (Kant), 282
greater stress on subjectivity than on objectivity in modern philosophy, 27

Occasionalism.
soul and body do not interact, 227, 236
soul's wishes read by God, the occasion for Him to intervene, 239

Omniconceptualism: the reduction of all reality to concepts, 30, 31, 173, 200, 201

Ontologism, Malebranchian. See Occasionalism
also described as occasionalism, 227.
conditioned by dualism of Descartes and illuminationism of Augustine, 237
spirit and body cannot interact except through divine power, 239
spirit knows through vision in God, 243

Optimal universe
all caused things follow from a most perfect nature and so are perfect (Spinoza), 253
Leibniz aware of Suárez's disproof, repeats his very words, 184
Leibnizian proof based on two principles, of Perfection, 222, and Sufficient Reason, 273
Leibnizian proof of optimal universe of individual perfection, 270, 271, 272, 273
optimal universe of the Scholastics (of types) & of Leibniz (of individuals), 222, 268
Scholastic disproof of optimal universe of individual perfection; four stages, 268, 270, 271, 272
Scholastic proof of optimal universe of graded perfection, 268
Suárez, anticipated disproof of Leibniz's optimal universe, 270

Predicaments, in Aristotle, Suárez and the Rationalists
Aristotle's predicaments accepted by Suárez as a pedagogical method, 225
Aristotelian predicaments and Suárez's reservations, 33, 216
Aristotelian substance-accidents dichotomy replaced by substance-modes dichotomy worked out by Suárez, 214

later philosophers' reservations on Aristotle's predicaments: Kant, 215
later philosophers' reservations on Kant's predicaments: Schopenhauer, Hegel, 215
predicaments transcended by being, 107
rationale for the sufficiency of the Aristotelian predicaments deficient, 33, 216
uncertainty about whether the predicaments belong to nominal or participial being, 108

Pre-established harmony of Leibniz
monads interrelated by harmony established by God, 34, 268
monads not a chaotic agglomeration, 268
pre-established harmony reconciles final and mechanical causality, 268

Principles of Perfection and Sufficient Reason. See Optimal Universe
Of Perfection, 222
Of Sufficient Reason, 270, 273, 291, 292

Rationalism: distinctive features. See *Cogitabilitas* ; Innate Ideas; Suárez's Anticipated Critique of the Rationalists
causal relation assimilated to logical implication; order of ideas corresponds to order of causes, 244
conceivability, thinkability, *cogitabilitas* (Leibniz), 31, 128, 260, 276.
definition of, 198, 226
divinization of man by the Rationalists, 256, 257, 258
evolved four great systems: dualism (Descartes), ontologism (Malebranche), monism (Spinoza), monadism (Leibniz), 54, 226
method favored by Rationalists: logical deduction of conclusions from the appropriate set of definitions (Spinoza), 244
patterned on mathematical method, known as the geometrical, 244
reduces metaphysical concerns to those of logic and epistemology, 276, 277
views the world as a system with an intellectual structure explicable through deduction, 198

Reification of concepts, See also Suarezian Critique of Thomism
John of St. Thomas avoids reified language, 148
non-reification of concepts, 68, 69, 70, 72
real entities are singular of themselves, not universals reified, 146
Thomist reified concepts, 145; essence and existence, 150; individuation by quantified matter, 145, 146, 147, 150, 214; limitation of unlimited Act by receptive potency, 160, 220; ; relative nonbeing, 117, 150
use of conceptual distinction (*distinctio rationis cum fundamento in re*) helps avoid reification, 214

Scientific Revolution
deficiencies of Aristotelianism: on experiment, collection of data,

and appeal to Aristotle's canonical authority, 192
heralded by Roger Bacon, inaugurated by Leonardo and Copernicus, mathematicized by Galileo and accomplished by Isaac Newton, 192
importance of mathematics, 191
inimical to prevalent Skepticism, 191
its principles conform to the basic Scholastic tenet, that knowledge begins with the senses, 191
two stages of scientific inquiry: observation to general principle; principle back to observation, 191

Scotism
15, 16, 17, 18, 42, 43, 44, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 61, 6 3, 64, 142, 166, 216, 291

Self-knowledge in the divine and human intellects
in the divine intellect: self-intellection precedes God's knowledge of creatures (John of St. Thomas), 257
in the human intellect: no human mind can be conscious of itself except through previous knowledge of phenomena (Kant), 257

Self-consciousness of the human mind
immediate, as is the case with God (Descartes), 257
mediate, through knowledge of actual things (Kant), 257

Simplicity, criterion of certainty
Cartesian simplicity, made possible by a multiplicity of rules, 206
composite simplicity, in Suárez, 204
incomposite simplicity, in Descartes, 205

Simplicity of God
contrasts with our abstruse and complex knowledge of Him, 194
divine simplicity, 71
divine simplicity a priori reason for creaturely multiplicity, 77, 158
its lack (in Spinoza's god), criticized by Suárez himself (in his anticipated critique of Spinozism), 255
professed by Spinoza early in his career, 252

Spinoza, attributes
affections of God's attributes known as modes, 246, 254
deduced a priori by Suárez from the entitative independence of God, 251
each of the infinite divine attributes is infinite, 247
express is a more explicit manner the perfection of the divine substance, 247
in Berkeley, 305
in their absolute nature or as conditioned by some mode, finite or infinite, 248, 251, 254
the more of reality a thing has the more its attributes; infinite reality equals infinite attributes, 247

Spinoza, triad of basic concepts. See also Spinoza, Attributes; Modes; Substance and Modes (in Spinoza)
attribute: that which the intellect perceives of substance as constituting its essence, 247

mode: that which is in something else and is conceived through something else, 248
substance: that which is in itself and is conceived through itself, 246

Spinozism, antinomies
divine substance declared to be absolutely perfect; but is identical with modes which are imperfect, 255
divine substance includes existence in its essence; but the modes, identical with the substance, do not include existence in their essence, 255

Suárez's anticipated critique of the Rationalists
of Descartes: the untenability of Cartesian dualism, 236
of Leibniz: the impossibility of an optimal world, 270
of Spinoza: the absurdity of a composite God, 255

Suarezian critique of Thomism.
See also Being and Existence in Classical Thomism;
Existence and Existencialism;
Individuation; Reification of Concepts; Thomism and
Suarezianism; Unity of Being,in Classical Thomism and Suarezianism; Univocity,
Thomist and Suarezian
analogy of proportionality,
Thomist, rejected by Suárez and some Thomists, 134, 163, 164
essence and existence, not really distinct, 116, 165
individuation by quantified matter in Thomism, 146
limitation, principle of, Thomism, and its redundancy, 162
non-existence of actuality of essence independent of divine causality, 124
reification of concepts in Thomism, 162
Suarezianism consumed Thomism, 166
Suarezianized Thomism, 143, 164
Thomism, its critics: Augustinians, Scotists, Nominalists, Suárez, 142, 168, 167, 168
Thomist principles open to debate and unnecessary to found a metaphysics, 145

Suarezianism
9, 14, 16, 18, 68, 77, 101, 116, 119, 141, 142, 150, 165, 166, 199.
See also:
Anamorphosis of Suárez; Being and Existence in Suárez; Distinctions, Suarezian
Theory of; Divine Nature in Suarezianism and Thomism; Essentialism, Alleged, of
Suárez; Existence and Existentialism; Formal Concept; Interrelationship of
Concepts: Composition and Focusing; Objective Concept; Predicaments, in
Aristotle, Suárez and the Rationalists; Suárez's Anticipated Critique of the
Rationalists; Suarezian Critique of Thomism; Substance and Modes in Suárez
Impacting Modern Philosophies; The Trichotomy, 1, 2, 3; Thomism and
Suarezianism; Univocity, Thomist and Suarezian

Subjectivity, 27, 174, 175, 282, 286, 287
finite subjectivity of Kant replaced by absolute subjectivity of Hegel, 175, 282
Hegelian absolute subjectivity removes obstacle to the knowledge of the thing-in-itself, 175
objective content turned by Descartes into a mere *modus cogitandi*, 175
preeminence of the subjective over the objective in Descartes, 175
preeminence of the subjective over the objective suggested by Suárez, 174
subjectivity becomes the basis of the objectivation of the sensible data in Kant, 282
subjectivity becomes the establisher of the objective appearance of the phenomena in Kant, 175
subjectivity totally identified with objectivity in Hegel, 175
unqualified preeminence of subjectivity in Kant, 282

Subsistence
in Berkeley, 34, 223, 302, 303, 304
in Glisson, 182, 298
in Leibniz, 303
in Suárez, 264, 265, 302, 303

Substance (and modes) in Descartes. See also, Dualism, Cartesian
man consists of two complete and mutually exclusive substances, unextended (soul) and extended (body), 226, 230; still, man somehow forms a unit, 226, 233, 234
substance is taken in its absolute sense, as something dependent on no other for its existence, 230
substance not perceived, but its attributes, especially the one property which constitutes the substance's nature or essence, 218

Substance (and modes) in Leibniz
activity: essential to substance (Leibniz); perfection of substance (Suárez), 263
monadic (suppositum=nature, Leibniz), dyadic (nature+subsistence, Suárez), 265
virtually contains all the attributes predicated of it (Leibniz), 265

Substance (and modes), in Locke, Glisson and Hume
for Glisson, the act of existence finds its perfection in substance, 182
for Locke substance has two senses, of substance proper and substratum, 306
linked to substance are modes, 307
notion of substance are modes, decaying in Locke, disintegrates with Hume, 308

Substance (and modes) in Malebranche,
substance and attribute differ conceptually, and substance and modes, modally, 230, 234
substance has less importance in Malebranche than it has in Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, 239

Substance and modes of Suárez, impacting on modern philosophy
absolute and relative senses of substance. Any entity existing in and by itself (absolutely) and as

sustaining accidents (relatively), 246
absolute sense alone retained by Spinoza late in life, 244, 245, 246
substance and modes developed from Suárez's critique of Aristotle's predicaments, 33, 230
substance and modes played a prominent role in the formation of Rationalist philosophies, 214
substance-mode-binary, accepted as a substitute for Aristotle's substance-
accident binary, by Descartes, Malebranche and Spinoza, but not by Suárez, 33, 215, 216
the two senses of Suárez's substance retained by Descartes, 244, 245

Substance (and modes), in Spinoza
constituents of the monist god, described as *natura naturans* (or substance) and *natura naturata* (or modes) 253
developed from the idea of substance of Suárez (through Descartes), 33, 244
monist doctrine identifying reality with single divine substance, 227, 244
monist god, *causa sui*, produces modes wholly identical with himself, 253
Spinozist monism, said to result from re-thinking of Cartesianism, 244

Supertranscendentalists. See Metaphysics, Object of, as Viewed by the Supertranscendentalists

Systematization in the Baroque period of unsystematized medieval thinkers:
Anselmianism, 14, 54, 58
Augustinianism, 16, 54, 56, 57
Bernardism, 14, 15, 49, 51, 57, 58, 63
Servite theology, 14, 54, 64

Systematization of theology and philosophy, phases
Inquiry into Christian doctrine, 37, 38
Methodical classification of Christian doctrines, 38
Investigation into theology's philosophical foundations, 41
Theological synthesis: commentarial method, 43
Theological synthesis: organic method, 45
Philosophical synthesis: commentarial method, 51
Philosophical synthesis: organic method, 52
Systematic integration of theology and philosophy: the super-system, 58

Theological and philosophical syntheses: schematic synopses
Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, 46
Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* (according to John of St. Thomas), 46, 167n
Aquinas's and Lombard's syntheses compared, 47
Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 45
Lombard's *Sentences* (according to Bonaventure), 43
Lombard's *Sentences* (according to Frassen), 44

Suárez, *Disputationes Metaphysicae*
Suárez, synopsis of oeuvre

Thing-in-itself. See Kantianism

Thomism
15, 16, 17, 18, 42, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 60, 62, 67, 68, 92, 97, 101, 103, 104, 105, 113, 116, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 128, 129, 134, 135, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 171, 193, 214, 220, 251

Thomism and Suarezianism
irreducibility of Suarezian and Thomist terminology, 97, 121, 134
modern Thomists' problems with interpretation of Thomas's thought, 16
plurality of Thomisms, analytical, 166
plurality of Thomisms, classical (Cajetanian), 48, 101, 134, 143, 149, 164, 165
plurality of Thomisms, historical (Gilsonian), 128, 143, 150, 166
plurality of Thomisms, transcendental (Marechalian), 142, 143, 166
Suarezianized Thomism: John of St. Thomas, 142. 143, 164
Thomist antipathy to Suárez, 105
Thomist conviction of Thomism being the normative Scholasticism, 104, 143

Transcendentals, number of
three (Suárez), *unum, verum, bonum*; number accepted by Kant
five (Aquinas): *res, unum, aliquid, verum, bonum*, 276, 282

Trichotomy, The, 1: Actual existence, participial being
100, 107, 109, 111, 112, 114, 120, 132, 133

Trichotomy, The, 2: Potential or possible existence:
108, 112, 120, 131

Trichotomy, The, 3: Aptitudinal or precisive existence, nominal being, *essentia realis* 69, 72, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 116, 120, 121, 130, 131, 132, 149

Unconditioned, the. See Kantianism

Unity of Being, in classical Thomism and Suarezianism
in classical Thomism (*simpliciter diversum et secundum quid unum*), 152
in Suarezianism (*simpliciter unum et secundum quid diversum*), 134, 151

Universals
in Descartes, what exist in reality are individuals; universals are in the mind, 221
in Locke, 34, 223, 298, 301
in Ockham, 152
in Suárez, 111, 118, 166
mental constructs based on similitude, 22, 221, 298, 300, 301, 302
mere names, 295
real entities are not universals reified and singularized, 146

rejected by medical science, 181, 298

Univocity, Thomist and Suarezian
simple unity (classical Thomism), 152
simple unity with uniform contraction to particulars (Suárez), 152
Suárez alleged to have supported univocity and rejected analogy, 134, 136

Vision in God (Malebranche)
is not the Beatific Vision, of the divine substance but only what is participable by creatures: a distinction without difference, 238, 243
replaces *cogito* as the foundation of philosophy (Malebranche), 242

Will/Will-to-be/Will-to-life, a blind driving force, (Schopenhauer), 291